

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI
(ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)**

**SATURDAY, THE THIRTY FIRST DAY OF JANUARY,
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO

AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SURESH REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 1852 OF 2021



Between:

1. K.Sanyasi Rao, S/o. Late Rama Rao, Age: 63 years, Office Sub-Ordinate (Retired), O/o. Asst. Director of Marketing, Srikakulam.
2. Danta Adinarayana, S/o. Lakshmaiah, Age: 60 years, Watchman (Retired), Government Polytechnic for Men, Srikakulam.

...Petitioners

AND

1. Sri J.Syamala Rao, IAS, Principal Secretary, WR Department, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi, Guntur District - 522503.
2. Dr Sameer Sharma, IAS, Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi, Guntur District - 522503.
3. Narayana Reddy Chinnaganta, Engineer -in- Chief, WR Department, Ramavarappadu, Vijayawada - 521108.
4. Venkata Raja Rajeswari Yanamala, Superintending Engineer, Irrigation Circle, WR Department, Opposite to Collectorate, Guntur - 522 004.
5. J.Gunakara Rao, General Superintendent, PW Workshop Division, Sithanagaram, Ramalayam Post, Guntur - 522501.
6. Shashibhushan Kumar, Principal Secretary, WR Department, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi, Guntur District 522503.
7. Peeyush Kumar, Principal Secretary, Finance Department, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi, Guntur District 522503.

8. Venkata Nagendra Anji Ratna Kumar Thota, Engineer in Chief, WR Department, Ramavarappadu, Vijayawada 521108.
9. Veera Pratap Narusu, Superintendent Engineer, Irrigation Circle, WR Department, Opposite to Collectorate, Guntur 522 004.
10. B.Srinivasa Rao, General Superintendent, PW Workshop Division, Sithanagaram, Ramalayam Post, Guntur 522501.

(RR 6 to 10 are impleaded as per Court Order dated 06.12.2024 vide I A No 1 of 2024 in C C No 1852 of 2021)

11. Sri Ravi Kiran, Assistant Director, Srikakulam.
12. Sri Dr.K.Narayana Rao, Principal, Polytechnic College, Srikakulam.

(RR 11 and 12 impleaded suo moto as per court order dated 12.09.2025 in CC No-1852 of 2021.)

...Respondents

WHEREAS the Petitioners have presented under Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act 1971, above case through their counsel Sri V.Sudhakar Reddy, praying that this Hon'ble High Court may be pleased to punish the respondents herein for their deliberate and willful disobedience of the orders in W.P.No.41 of 2021, dated 14.07.2021;

WHEREAS the said case coming on for hearing on this day and whereas the High Court upon perusing the affidavit filed herein and the orders of High Court dated 10.12.2021, 27.09.2024, 06.12.2024, 04.07.2025, 01.08.2025, 12.09.2025, 10.10.2025, & 02.01.2026, made herein and upon hearing the arguments of Sri V.Sudhakar Reddy, Advocate for the Petitioner and of Sri K.Bheema Rao, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1, 3 and 5 and of Sri G.Raju, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 4 and 7 and of Sri K.Ramalingeswara Rao, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 6, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, made the following

ORDER:

The respondents 7, 11 & 12 have filed their respective counter affidavits.

The 7th respondent, who is the Principal Secretary, Finance Department, in his affidavit, has stated that no proposals for payment have been received by the Finance Department, though financial concurrence had already been given.

The respondent No.11, who is the Assistant Director of Marketing, Srikakulam, has also filed a counter affidavit. In this counter affidavit, the respondent No.11 states that though the order in W.P.No.41 of 2021 is dated 14.07.2021, compliance could not be done as it involves verification of service particulars and audit scrutiny which cannot be completed mechanically or instantaneously.

As this statement has been made by respondent No.11, in a sworn affidavit, it would be appropriate that respondent No.11 is personally present before this Court to explain to this Court as to how the period of four years, since the filing of the Contempt Case, is to be treated as instantaneous period. The respondent No.11 would also submit that the remaining payment could not be affected due to non-clearance by the Finance Department.

In these circumstances, there is a need for reconciliation of the statements made by respondent No.7 and respondent No.11. As the averments in the affidavit filed by respondent No.12 also states that payment could not be made on account of non-sanction of funds by the Finance Department, it would be appropriate that this issue needs reconciliation.

Post on 20.02.2026.

It is expected that by then, a reconciliation exercise shall be undertaken to reconcile these two statements and appropriate facts shall be set out by that date. Further, the respondents 11 & 12 shall be personally present before this Court on the next date of hearing.

Sd/-U.SRIDEVI
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//


SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. Sri Ravi Kiran, Assistant Director of Agriculture Marketing, Srikakulam.
2. Sri Dr.K.Narayana Rao, Principal, Polytechnic College, Srikakulam
(Addressee Nos. 1 & 2 by Speed Post directed to appear before this Court on 20.02.2026)
3. One CC to Sri V.Sudhakar Reddy, Advocate[OPUC]
4. One CC to Sri Ramalingeswara Rao Kocharla Kota, Advocate[OPUC]
5. One CC to Sri K.Bheema Rao, Advocate[OPUC]
6. One CC to Sri G.Raju, Advocate[OPUC]
7. Two spare copies

PSR

HIGH COURT

RRR,J

&

KSR,J

DATE:31.01.2026.

NOTE: Post on 20.02.2026.

ORDER

CC.No.1852 of 2021

APPEARANCE

