



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

[3329]

TUESDAY, THE 7th DAY OF JULY 2026

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU
NIMMAGADDA**

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 3181/2025

Between:

1. BONI LAKSHMI (DIED), A
2. KOPPARTHI SUDHA RANI,, C/O MUNI SWAMY, AGED 50 YEARS, RESIDENT OF D.NO.4-55-36/A, SANTHAPETA, NEAR SAPTHAGIRI CINEMA HALL, CHITTIVALASA, BHIMINIPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. KINTHALI KIRAN KUMAR, Mandal Revenue Officer, MRO Office, Ranasthalam Mandalam, Srikakulam District.

...CONTEMNOR

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 please to punish the respondent here in under sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act 1971 for his willful and deliberate disobedience to the orders of this Hon'ble High Court in W.P. No. 28218/2025 dated 24-07-2024

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant leave to the petitioner to file the present contempt petition against the contemnor/respondent No.3 in WP.No.28218/2024 as the petitioner in place of Late Boina Lakshmi and pass.

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1.SAMBOJU BALA GOPAL

Counsel for the Contemnor:

1.BH RAMA KRISHNA NAIK

The Court made the following:

ORDER

This contempt case is filed against the respondent for wilful disobedience of the orders dated 27.03.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.No.28218 of 2024.

If the petitioner again requested time for compliance, the respondents not pleaded the request of the petitioner. Hence, the contempt petition.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that before filing the contempt case, the respondents have complied with the orders passed by this Court and passed speaking order after providing an opportunity. On 29.07.2025, the respondents rejected the claim of the petitioner for mutation under Section 12 of the A.P.Rights in Land and Pattadar PassBooks Act, 1971, and also rules made thereon.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents.

Perused the material on record.

Issue for determination before the Court is whether the respondents are committed any contempt or wilful deliberate of the orders of this Court or not. For which, the order has been extracted as under:-

“..Having regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for the respondents and on perusal of the material placed on record, this Court is of the considered view that the present writ petition can be disposed of, directing the petitioner to make an appropriate application in Form-6A to

the respondent authorities strictly adhering to the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Land in Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971 and Rules framed therein from time to time for correction of entries in the concerned revenue records through Mee Seva/ AP Online/ Village Secretariat and also in terms of G.O.Ms.No.209 dated 14.06.2017 and on payment of requisite fee, along with all the required documents, within a period of two (02) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. On receipt of such application, the respondents are directed to consider the same and pass appropriate orders, after providing due opportunity of hearing to all the parties concerned, within a period of three (03) months, thereafter.”

This Court specifically directed the respondents to consider the Form-6-A submitted by the petitioner, after providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and passed a speaking order, in accordance with law.

On perusal of the written instructions, particularly speaking order passed by the respondent authorities on 29.07.2025 indicates that the respondent authorities provided an opportunity of hearing and issued notice to the petitioner on 24.07.2025, after providing such opportunity, the detailed speaking order was passed by rejecting the claim of the petitioners. Since the subject land was classified as Government land, as there is no provision for effecting mutation and issuance of pattadar passbook in respect of such land in favour of the petitioner.

In view of the declaration regarding subject land as government land vide proceedings dated 29.07.2025. The petitioner is at liberty to challenge such declaration if it is against record and rights of the petitioner. However, in view of passing of the speaking order, the orders of this Court is complied with, further the petitioner is at liberty to challenge the same by way of appropriate proceedings. Accordingly, the contempt case is closed.

This contempt case is filed against the respondents for wilful disobedience of the orders dated 27.03.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.No.28218 of 2024.

It is the case of the petitioner that, despite requesting time for compliance, the respondents did not consider the request of the petitioner. Hence, the present contempt petition.

Learned counsel for the respondents submits that, even before the filing of the contempt case, the respondents had complied with the orders passed by this Court by providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and thereafter passing a speaking order. By proceedings dated 29.07.2025, the respondents rejected the claim of the petitioner for mutation under Section 12 of the A.P. Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971, and the Rules made thereunder.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the respondents.

Perused the material on record.

The issue for determination before this Court is whether the respondents have committed any contempt by wilfully and deliberately disobeying the orders of this Court. For ready reference, the relevant portion of the order is extracted hereunder:

“..Having regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for the respondents and on perusal of the material placed on record, this Court is of the considered view that the present writ petition can be disposed of, directing the petitioner to make an appropriate application in Form-6A to the respondent authorities strictly adhering to the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Land in Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971 and Rules framed therein from time to time for correction of entries in the concerned revenue records through Mee Seva/AP Online/Village Secretariat and also in terms of G.O.Ms.No.209 dated 14.06.2017 and on payment of requisite fee, along with all the required documents, within a period of two (02) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. On receipt of such application, the respondents are directed to consider the same and pass appropriate orders, after providing due opportunity of hearing to all the parties concerned, within a period of three (03) months thereafter.”

This Court specifically directed the respondents to consider the Form-6A application submitted by the petitioner, after providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, and pass a speaking order in accordance with law.

A perusal of the written instructions, particularly the speaking order passed by the respondent authorities on 29.07.2025, indicates that the respondent authorities issued notice to the petitioner on 24.07.2025, provided an opportunity of hearing, and thereafter passed a detailed speaking order rejecting the claim of the petitioner. The claim was rejected on the ground that the

subject land was classified as Government land and that there is no provision for effecting mutation and issuance of a Pattadar Pass Book in respect of such land in favour of the petitioner.

In view of the declaration of the subject land as Government land vide proceedings dated 29.07.2025, the petitioner is at liberty to challenge the said proceedings, if they are contrary to the record or affect the rights of the petitioner. However, since a speaking order has been passed, the directions of this Court have been complied with. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the said order, it is open to the petitioner to challenge the same by initiating appropriate proceedings in accordance with law.

Accordingly, the Contempt Case is closed.