



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3492]

FRIDAY, THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SURESH REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 1794/2021

Between:

N. Ramakrishna,

...PETITIONER

AND

Mr Harinarayanan Ias and Others

...CONTEMNOR(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. T Nagaraja

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1. P SUBASH

2. SUSHMA YAGANTI

3. J DILEEP KUMAR

The Court made the following Order:

This Court, by an Order, dated 21.10.2020 had directed the District Collector, Chittoor, to pass orders on the representation of the villagers who had claimed that endowment land belonging to Sri Pattabhiramaswamy Temple situated in Vayalpadu Grampanchayat and Mandal, Chittoor District was encroached and no steps were taken to protect the said land.

2. Though the direction of this Court was to dispose of the said representation within a period of two months, no steps were taken. Aggrieved by the said inaction of the authorities, the present Contempt Case came to be filed by the petitioner. As the Chittoor District had been reorganized and the area in question fell within Annamayya District, the 3rd respondent, who is the incumbent District Collector, Annamayya District was impleaded as the 3rd respondent.

3. As the counter affidavit was not filed, this Court on 20.02.2026 had directed that the 3rd respondent should file the counter affidavit by the next date of hearing, failing which he would have to personally present before this Court. On such direction, the 3rd respondent has now filed a counter affidavit, dated 12.03.2026.

4. In this counter affidavit, the 3rd respondent submits that there were certain discrepancies between the Inam fair register and the RSR record, due to which he was unable to move forward. The 3rd respondent would also state that on account of this discrepancy, letters were being addressed to the Government in the year 2021 for clarification as to which record should be followed. Apart from this, the 3rd respondent would also state that the RSR records show that the tax was being imposed on the lands in question, due to which there is a possibility that the land is not endowment land. The 3rd respondent, finally states that the clarifications are needed to obtain from the Government before the order of this Court, dated 21.10.2010, can be complied.

5. We are not satisfied with the reasons given in the said counter affidavit. It is clear that there is a deliberate disobedience of the orders of this Court. In the circumstances, the 3rd respondent shall be personally present before this Court on the next date of hearing.

6. Post on 24.04.2026.

R. RAGHUNANDAN RAO, J

K SURESH REDDY, J

Date: 17.04.2026

BSM