Date of reserved for orders : --
Date of pronouncement : 25-06-2026
Date of uploading : 06-07-2026

APHC010109152020

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI [3209]
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE 25th DAY OF JUNE 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

CONTEMPT CASE No: 384 of 2020

Between:

1. DENKURI RAVI, S/o.BHASKAR RAJU,AGED 53 YEARS, R/O D.No. 8-44-14/3, SAI KRISHNA TOWERS, OLD C.B.I. ROAD, CHINNA WALTAIR, VISAKHAPATNAM, A.P.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. G SRIJANA, COMMISSIONER, THE GREATER VISAKHAPATNAM MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, ASILMUETTA JUNCTION, VISAKHAPATNAM.

...CONTEMNOR

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. Mr.P R K AMERANDRA KUMAR

Counsel for the Contemnor:

1. Mr.S LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDY(SC FOR GVMC)

The Court made the following order:

The present Contempt Case is filed alleging violation of the orders dated 02.04.2019 passed in W.P.No.2894 of 2019.

2. The writ petition was disposed of at the stage of admission with a direction to the 2nd respondent to take appropriate action on the complaint dated 04.02.2019 stated to have been made by the petitioner in accordance with the Law and communicate the same to the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

3. The grievance of the petitioner in the said writ petition is that the 4th respondent therein constructed a residential building in deviation of the sanctioned plan without leaving any setbacks and using the same for commercial purpose by running a Lodge without providing any parking area and occupying the colony roads and thereby obstructing free flow of the traffic.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently submits that the complaint of the petitioner was not considered within the stipulated time and further as seen from the counter-affidavit, the unauthorized construction appears to have been regularized which ought not to have been done. He also submits that even the said regularization, without considering the complaint of the petitioner is illegal and unsustainable. Making the said submissions, the learned counsel urges for passing appropriate orders of punishment against the respondents.

5. On the other hand, Mr.S.Lakshmi Narayanareddy, learned counsel representing the respondent made submissions with reference to the counter-affidavit dated 31.12.2020. He submits that while the complaint of the petitioner is taken up for appropriate action, the 4th respondent in the writ petition submitted application for regularization of deviations of unauthorized constructions under BPS, considering the said application, the constructions made by the 4th respondent were regularized. He submits that in fact, the Endorsement dated 09.11.2020 in this regard has been communicated to the petitioner through registered post. He submits that regularization of the premises in question was done, as per the scheme, which was in vogue at that point of time and at any rate, if the petitioner has any grievance, he should have taken recourse to Law. He also submits that a separate Endorsement dated 02.12.2020 was also issued to the petitioner. He submits that no case is made out for initiating proceedings under the Contempt of Courts Act.

6. This Court, after considering the submissions made by the counsel on both sides and keeping in view the subsequent developments as also limited scope in contempt proceedings, is inclined to close the same by leaving it open to the petitioner to work out remedies against the Endorsement dated 09.11.2020, in accordance with the Law, if he is so advised.

7. Accordingly, the Contempt Case is closed. No costs. Consequently, all pending applications, if any, shall stand closed.

NINALA JAYASURYA, J

Date: 25.06.2026
BLV

Whether the order is :
Speaking Yes/No / Recorded Yes/No
Reportable Yes/No / Non-Reportable Yes/No

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

C.C.No.384 of 2020

Dt: 25.06.2026

BLV