



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

[3331]

FRIDAY, THE SECOND DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 3661/2024

Between:

K Ramachandra

...PETITIONER

AND

Sri Kantilal Dandeddismissed and Others

...CONTEMNOR(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.A G SATYANARAYANA RAO

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1.ARAVALA RAMA RAO(SC FOR APSRTC KKAC)

2.

The Court made the following:

Sri A.Rama Rao, learned counsel for the respondent, on instructions, would submit that the sole respondent has retired on attaining the age of superannuation and that the present incumbent is Smt. Sri Laxmi, District Public Transport Officer.

Given the facts and circumstances of the case, Smt. Sri Laxmi, District Public Transport Officer, *suo-moto*, is impleaded as respondent No.2 to the contempt case.

Registry is directed to carry out the necessary amendments in the contempt case as well as in the interlocutory applications, if any.

Issue notice to respondent No.2.

The above contempt case was filed complaining violation of the interim order dated 06.08.2024 in I.A.No.1 of 2024 in W.P.No.16921 of 2024.

The petitioner filed the aforementioned writ petition, aggrieved by the proceedings *vide* Order No. P4/369(1)/2024.DPT.A dated 03.07.2024, issued by the District Public Transport Officer, APSRTC/APTTD, Anantapuram District, ordering recovery of an amount of Rs.3,53,767/-. An interim order was passed on 06.08.2024, granting stay of the proceedings impugned in the writ petition. The said order was passed in the presence of the learned Standing Counsel.

Despite the interim order, the respondent authority proceeded further and started deducting the amount.

Sri A.Rama Rao, learned counsel for the respondent, did not dispute the said fact.

ADMIT.

The following charges are framed against the respondents:

- 1) Whether the respondent violated the interim order dated 06.08.2024 in W.P.No.16921 of 2024 deliberately and intentionally?
- 2) Whether the respondent is liable to be punished under Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act r/w Article 215 of the Constitution of India?

List the matter on 30.01.2026.

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

SNI