

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

THURSDAY, THE NINETEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY,
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD
CONTEMPT CASE NO: 3333 OF 2025

Between:

Thota Siva Sai, S/o. Thota Subramanyam, Occ: Vice President, Railway
Kodur Gram Panchayat, Aged about 56 years, R/o.House No.2/38A, Baliya
Street, Railway Kodur, Annamayya District, A.P -516101.

...Petitioner

AND

1. Chamakuri Sreedhar, District Collector, Annamayya District, A.P.
2. Shaik Mastan Valli, District Panchayat Officer, Annamayya District, A.P.

...Contemnor/

Respondent No.2 and 3

In W.P.No.6986 of 2025

WHEREAS the Petitioner has presented under Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act 1971, the above case through his counsel M/s CKR Associates, praying the High Court to punish the respondents herein for gross and wilful violation of the orders passed in W.P.No.6986 of 2025 dated 20.03.2025;

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 12.11.2025 made herein and upon hearing the arguments of Sri N.Sai Phanindra Kumar, Advocate for the Petitioner and of Sri Kochiri Rama Rao, Advocate for Respondents, made the following

ORDER:

“Heard Sri N. Sai Phanindra Kumar, learned Counsel for the Petitioner and Sri Rama Rao Kochiri, learned Counsel for the Respondents.

2. The Counter Affidavit filed by Respondent No.1 has been perused by the Court. The explanation given by Respondent No.1 in paras 4 & 6 are unconvincing, inasmuch as the Respondent No.1 has not even furnished the details including the name of the Extension Officer and the time of seizure of the record by the Extension Officer. The least that the Respondent No.1 could have done is to have the Affidavit of Extension Officer also be filed in the present Contempt Proceedings to indicate the correctness of the averments.


3. In this view of the matter, the Court is inclined to issue Form-I Notice to Respondent No.1.

4. Having regard to the facts of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to dispense with the formal mode of Notice. Instead, Sri Rama Rao Kochiri, learned Counsel representing the Respondent No.1 shall inform to the Respondent No.1 as regards the issuance of Form-I Notice to him.

5. List on 25.02.2026.”

//TRUE COPY//

Sd/-U.SRIDEVI
DEPUTY REGISTRAR


SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. Chamakuri Sreedhar, District Collector, Annamayya District, A.P.(by **SPEED POST**)
2. One CC to M/s CKR Associates, Advocate [OPUC]
3. One CC to Sri Rama Rao Kochiri, Advocate [OPUC]
4. The Section Officer, O.S.Section, High Court of A.P., Amaravati.
5. One spare copy.

PSD

HIGH COURT


GRKP,J

DATE:19/02/2026

NOTE: LIST ON 25.02.2026

ORDER

CC.No.3333 of 2025



DIRECTION