

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY FIFTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

:PRESENT:

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 1409 OF 2025

Between

1. Vanka Ankamma, W/o. Satyanarayana.
2. Sonde Gopamma, W/o. Ramulu
3. Vanka Ramaiah, S/o. Venkaiah
4. Sode Ramesh, S/o. Lakshmaiah
5. Paida Bhadraiah, S/o. Ramaiah
6. Kanithi Bhupathi, S/o. Raju
7. Payam Krishna, S/o. Veeraiah
8. Messa Bhadraiah, S/o. Veeraiah

...Petitioners/Petitioners No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7,
11 & 12 in WP. No. 29791/23

AND

1. Sri Maqsood, The Forest Divisional Officer, Manuguru Division, Bhadradri-Kothagudem District.
2. Sri Siddaboina Ramesh, The Forest Range Officer, Aswapuram Range, Aswapuram Mandal, Bhadradri-Kothagudem District.
3. Smt. Bhukya Sujatha, Forest Section Officer, Sarapaka Section, Aswapuram Range, Aswapuram Mandal, Bhadradri-Kothagudem District.
4. Sri B. Upendra, Forest Beat Officer, Krishna Sagar Beat, Sarapaka Section, Aswapuram Range, Aswapuram Mandal, Bhadradri-Kothagudem District.
5. Sri B. Rahul, I.A.S, Project Officer, The Integrated Tribal Development Agency, Bhadradrachalam, Bhadradri- Kothagudem District.

...Respondents

WHEREAS the petitioners have presented the Contempt Case under Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, through their Counsel Sri Ch. Ravi Kumar, praying the High Court to summon and punish all the respondents herein for their wilful disobedience of this Court order Dt.04-03-2025 passed in W.P.No.29791 of 2023;

Counsel for the Petitioners	:	SRI CH. RAVI KUMAR
Counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 to 4:		ASST. GOVT. PLEADER FOR FOREST
Counsel for Respondent No. 5	:	GOVT. PLEADER FOR SOCIAL WELFARE

WHEREAS the said case coming on for hearing, and whereas the High Court, upon perusing the affidavit filed therein, and the earlier order 27-6-2025 and 24-04-2026, made the following;

ORDER:

Heard Sri Ch. Ravi Kumar, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and learned Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents.

This Court opines that though specific directions had been issued to the respondent No.8 in Writ Petition No.29791 of 2023, vide orders dated 04.03.2025 who is the competent authority, to decide the subject issue after conducting due enquiry, the compliance as explained by the learned Government Pleader appearing on behalf of respondents, is not compliance in true spirit of the orders of this Court dated 04.03.2025 passed in W.P. No.29791 of 2023 and the same is in fact in clear violation of the orders of this Court dated 04.03.2025 passed in W.P. No.29791 of 2023.

This Court opines that the request of the petitioner for issuance of forest rights pattas in favour of the petitioners herein needs to be examined in accordance to law, in conformity with principles of natural justice as per the mandate under the statute by constituting a Committee which admittedly had not been done even as on date and the proceedings dated 24.06.2025 had been issued by the RDO, Bhadrachalam unilaterally rejecting the request of the petitioners.

A bare perusal of the record clearly indicates that a detailed report had been called for in the matter in particular referring to the petitioners in W.P. No.29791 of 2023. But curiously however the claim of the petitioners had not been examined by a Committee to be constituted as mandated under law to duly examine the subject issue for the issuance of ROR pattas under the Forests Act, 1967.

The Apex Court in the judgment reported in 2017 vol.5 SCC 506 in Baranagore Jute Factory PLC. Mazdoor Sangh (BMS) and Others Vs. Baranagore Jute Factory PLC. And Others, at para No.23 observed as under:-

“23. As held by this Court in DDA v. Skipper Construction co.(p.) Ltd., and going a step further the Court has duty to issue appropriate directions for remedying or rectifying the things done in violation of the orders. In that regard the Court may even take restitutive measures at any stage of the proceedings.”

The Judgment of the Apex Court reported in MANU/SC/0842/2022 in “STATE BANK OF INDIA v. VIJAY MALLYA”, in particular, at the relevant portion at para 13, it is observed as under:

“13. It is, thus, well settled that apart from punishing the contemnor for his contumacious conduct, the majesty of law may demand that appropriate directions be issued by the court so that any advantage secured as a result of such contumacious conduct is completely nullified. The approach may require the court to pass directions either for reversal of the transactions in question by declaring said transactions to be void or passing appropriate directions to the concerned authorities to see that the contumacious conduct on the part of the contemnor does not continue to ensure to the advantage of the contemnor or any one claiming under him. It is precisely for these reasons that the direction to have vacant possession delivered to the rightful claimant was passed by this Court in Noorali Babul Thanewala v. K.M.M. Shetty and Ors. MANU/SC/0077/1990 : (1990) 1 SCC 259. Mere passing of an order of punishment as stated by this Court in Pravin C. Shah v. K.A. Mohd. Ali and Anr. MANU/SC/0622/2001 : (2001) 8 SCC 650 would not be enough or sufficient. In a given case, to meet the ends of justice, the concept of purging of the contempt

would call for complete disgorging of all the benefits secured as a result of actions which are found by the court to be contumacious.

Taking into consideration the view of the Apex Court in the Judgments (referred to and extracted above), this Court opines that since the order of this Court dated 04.03.2025 passed in W.P. No.29791 of 2023 had not been implemented in its true spirit appropriate directions need to be issued for remedying or rectifying the things done in violation of the orders of this Court.

Hence, the respondents are directed to comply with the order of this Court dated 04.03.2025 passed in W.P. No.29791 of 2023 in its true spirit by the next date of hearing, without reference to the proceedings RC No.B/689.2025, dated 24.06.2025 issued by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Bhadrachalm on the basis of Report of Forest Divisional Officer, Manuguru, Letter Number 199/2024/ MNGR, dated 20.05.2025 rejecting the request of the petitioners for issuance of ROFR Pattas in the lands situated in Krishna Sagar Beat, Aswapuram Range issued in pursuance and in compliance of the directions of this Court dated 04.03.2025 passed in W.P. No. 29791 of 2023, failing which the respondents shall appear before this Court on 24.07.2026

As per the directions of this Court dated 24.04.2026, the respondents in the present Contempt Case are present before this Court on this the 25th day of June, 2026 and their presence is dispensed with for the present.

List on 24.07.2026 under the caption, "FOR COMPLIANCE".

Sd/- N.CHANDRA SEKHAR RAO
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//


SECTION OFFICER

To

1. Sri Maqsood, Forest Divisional Officer, Manuguru Division, Bhadradi- Kothagudem District.
2. Sri Siddaboina Ramesh, Forest Range Officer, Aswapuram Range, Aswapuram Mandal, Bhadradi-Kothagudem District.
3. Smt. Bhukya Sujatha, Forest Section Officer, Sarapaka Section, Aswapuram Range, Aswapuram Mandal, Bhadradi-Kothagudem District.
4. Sri B. Upendra, Forest Beat Officer, Krishna Sagar Beat, Sarapaka Section, Aswapuram Range, Aswapuram Mandal, Bhadradi-Kothagudem District.
5. Sri B. Rahul, I.A.S, Project Officer, The Integrated Tribal Development Agency, Bhadrachalam, Bhadradi- Kothagudem District. (Addressees 1 to 5 BY SPEED POST)
6. Two CCs to GP for Forest, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad (OUT)
7. Two CCs to GP for Social Welfare, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad (OUT)
8. One CC to Sri Ch. Ravi Kumar, Advocate (OPUC)
9. One Spare Copy

HIGH COURT

SN,J

DATE: 25-06-2026

List on 24.07.2026 under the caption, "FOR COMPLIANCE"

ORDER

C.C. NO. 1409 OF 2025



**DISPENSING WITH THE PRESENCE
OF RESPONDENTS FOR THE PRESENT
AND DIRECTION**