

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA  
AT HYDERABAD

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY NINTH DAY OF APRIL  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**:PRESENT:**  
**THE HON'BLE JUSTICE MOUSHUMI BHATTACHARYA**  
**AND**  
**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GADI PRAVEEN KUMAR**

**CONTEMPT CASE NO: 1678 OF 2026**

**Between**

Shalini Boyamotla, W/o. Bharath Kumar Pogula, R/o. House No. 1-7-700002, Sriram Nagar-2,  
Pedda Thanda (Vill), Khammam Dist., Telangana - 507003

...Petitioner

**AND**

Bharath Kumar Pogula, S/o. Satya Narayana, Currently residing at: 1914 NW Elm Ave,  
Redmond, Oregon, USA- 97756, Having permanent address at: Flat No.- 403, Sai Kashyap  
Nilayam, Hanuman Nagar, Opposite KU 1<sup>st</sup> Gate Hanamkonda, Telangana- 506009.

Respondent

WHEREAS the petitioner has presented the Contempt Case under Sections 10 to 12 of  
the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, through her Counsel Ms. Chada Sriharshitha, praying the  
High Court to punish the respondent for wilfully disobeying the order dated 23-03-2026 passed  
in WP. No. 7059 of 2026;

**Counsel for the Petitioner : SRI RAJIV SHAKDHER, Senior Counsel**  
**representing MS. CHADA SRIHARSHITHA**

**Counsel for Respondent : SRI U.SHANTHI BHUSHAN RAO**

WHEREAS the said case coming on for hearing, and whereas the High Court, upon  
perusing the affidavit filed therein and earlier order dated 15.04.2026, made the following;

**ORDER:**

**From the report filed by the learned Advocate Commissioner in  
Court today, there is *prima facie* a clear case of contempt committed on  
the part of the respondent of the direction issued by this Court on  
23.03.2026.**

**By the order, it is made clear that every video call between the petitioner  
and the children shall continue for a minimum duration of 15 minutes.  
The report indicates otherwise.**

In fact, the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the respondent is that the calls could not last for the duration of 15 minutes by reason of the minor children cutting the calls, is refuted by the learned Advocate Commissioner, who is present in the Court.

The learned Advocate Commissioner submits that the respondent is continuously present beside the minor children and minor children looking at the respondent before cutting the call. The observation of the learned Advocate Commissioner which forms part of the report, also states *inter alia* that the respondent is not cooperating in the calls made by the petitioner and the respondent's presence is affecting the children's interaction with the petitioner. It is also stated that the calls are abruptly disconnected while the children are speaking to the petitioner.

Since we have heard the learned counsel appearing for the parties repeated occasions, we take the aberration and non-compliance extremely seriously. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent is directed to ensure that the respondent allows the calls to last for a minimum duration of 15 minutes as directed by the Court, failing which, the respondent shall be liable for serious consequences in accordance with law of contempt.

The learned Advocate Commissioner is requested to continue to monitor the calls as directed earlier.

The Court is informed that the Advocate Commissioner has been paid as directed at the first instance.

List these matters on 15.06.2026, as prayed for.

//TRUE COPY//

Sd/- A.V.S.PRASAD  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

  
SECTION OFFICER

To

1. Ms. M.N. Akshara Reddy, Advocate, (Cell No. 91009 18668), High Court Advocates' Association, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad (BY SPL. MESSENGER)
2. One CC to Ms. Chada Sriharshitha, Advocate (OPUC)
3. One CC to Sri U. Shanthi Bhushan Rao, Advocate (OPUC)
4. Two Spare Copies

**HIGH COURT**

**MB,J  
&  
GPK,J**

**DATE: 29.04.2026**

**NOTE: POST ON 15.06.2026**

**ORDER**

**C.C. NO. 1678 OF 2026**

**DIRECTION**

