



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

[3457]

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

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 2785/2025

Between:

1.M/S.HARICONS-GPR INFRA (JV), REP. BY ITS AUTHORISED
SIGNATORY SRI GANGINENI RAJESH KUMAR S/O G.PRABHAKAR,
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS, OCC- BUSINESS R/O D.NO. 11-1-474-1-3,
ARAVIND NAGAR ANANTHAPUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH -
515 001

...PETITIONER

AND

1.K VIJAYANAND, S/O NOT KNOWN OCC- SPECIAL CHIEF
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (UH) DEPARTMENT, A.P
SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR
DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH-522 238.

2.S SURESH KUMAR, S/O NOT KNOWN OCC- PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH AND MUNICIPAL
ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT, A.P SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS,
VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA
PRADESH-522 238.

3.P SAMPATH KUMAR, S/O NOT KNOWN OCC- THE PROJECT
DIRECTOR, APUFIDC, 5TH FLOOR, DHOOM COMPLEX,
SRINIVASANAGAR BANK COLONY, VIJAYAWADA, NTR DISTRICT,
ANDHRA PRADESH - 520 008.

4.M PRABHAKAR RAO, . S/O NOT KNOWN OCC- THE ENGINEER-IN-
CHIEF, PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT, FLAT NOS.504 AND 601,

GARUDA APARTMENTS, TADEPALLI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH-522 501.

5.R RAMAMOHANA REDDY, S/O NOT KNOWN OCC- THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, PUBLIC HEALTH CIRCLE, ANANTAPURAMU, ANANTAPUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 515 001.

6.B ADINARAYANA, S/O NOT KNOWN OCC- THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, PUBLIC HEALTH DIVISION, ANANTAPURAMU, ANANTAPUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 515 001.

7.J RAMANA MURTHY, S/O NOT KNOWN OCC- THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, PUBLIC HEALTH DIVISION, KADAPA, YSR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 516 001.

...CONTEMNOR(S):

Petition under Sections 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act 1971 praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit file herein the High Court may be pleased to punish the contemnors /respondents under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act for willfully and wantonly violating the orders of this Honble High Court in W.P.No.6535 of 2024 dated 15.07.2025 and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.GHANTA SRIDHAR

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1.SREEKANTH REDDY AMBATI

The Court made the following:

Order:-

The learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that, in compliance of the orders passed by this Court on 13.03.2026, whereby the petitioner and the 6th respondent have finalized the bills payable to the petitioner, proceedings dated 22.04.2026 have been issued by the Executive Engineer.

2. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the order passed by the Executive Engineer is patently erroneous, as they have referred to the agreement conditions with regard to completing the laying and jointing of procured pipes within a period of three (03) months from the date of procurement. It is also stated in the said proceedings that the petitioner has not laid the entire procured material and, as such, notice of termination was issued in the month of March, 2024, and that the agency has not handed over the unused material to the department. The proceedings do not refer to Clause 59.5 of the agreement conditions, which reads as follows:

“If the contract is terminated, the contractor shall stop work immediately, make the site safe and secure, and leave the site as soon as reasonably possible.”

3. It is submitted that, in pursuance of the said conditions of the contract, the petitioner had vacated the site, and it was for the officers concerned to inform the petitioner at the time of leaving the site with regard to any shortfall of the material. The shortfall of the material cannot be raised for the first time after filing of the contempt case, and no such proceedings or communication

quantifying the material which is to be appropriated to the respondents has been notified to the petitioner at any point of time. It is also curious to note that the respondents have taken a stand only to water down the claim of the petitioner and have, in turn, called upon the petitioner to deposit certain amounts. This is a deliberate dispute raised by the Executive Engineer to deny the claim of the petitioner. The petitioner had terminated the contract and it is not the case that the respondents have issued the notice of termination of the contract.

4. Considering Clauses 24 and 25 of the conditions of contract, the petitioner would have to raise the dispute before the adjudicator to be appointed by the petitioner and the concerned respondent and take forward the dispute resolution mechanism as devised under the contract. As several issues of fact are raised by the respondents, this Court cannot go into such facts, though it is evident that a deliberate attempt is made to delay or deny the petitioner's claim on behalf of the respondents.

5. With this observation, this contempt case is closed, leaving it open for the petitioner to take appropriate steps. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE HARINATH.N

