

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH

C.C.No.190 of 2014

Between:

_____ Smt. D.Naga Bhavani,W/o. S.Mahanandi Reddy.
_____ Aged about 25 years, R/o. China Malkapuram Village.
_____ Dhone Mandal, Kurnool District rep. by her husband
_____ S.Mahanandi Reddy.

...Petitioner

And

_____ Mr. Susheel Kumar, Director Mines & Geology,
_____ 8th Floor, BRKR Bhavan, Near Tank Bund, Hyderabad.

-

... Respondent

JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED ON: 2108.2015

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH
RANGANATHAN**

-
1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments? _____ :
-
2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reports/Journals _____ :
-
3. Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment? _____ :

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH
RANGANATHAN**

-

Contempt Case No.190 of 2014

ORDER:

The order, violation of which is alleged in this contempt case, is the order passed by this Court in W.P.M.P.No.24914 of 2013 in W.P.No20308 of 2013 dated 19.07.2013, whereby respondents 1 and 2 were directed to ensure that no illegal mining operations are carried on the subject land. This Court made it clear that the said interim order would not preclude the 2nd respondent from passing orders as directed by this Court earlier in W.P.No.12441 of 2010 dated 25.04.2013;

and, thereafter, to permit the lessee to carry on mining operations in accordance with law.

Learned counsel on either side would fairly state that no orders have been passed by the 2nd respondent pursuant to the order of this Court in W.P.No.12441 of 2010 dated 25.04.2013. While the petitioner alleges that respondents are carrying on illegal mining operations, the 2nd respondent, in his counter affidavit, has stated that he had instructed all concerned not to permit any mining operations, basing on the said leases, till final orders are passed as per the directions in W.P.No.12441 of 2010 dated 25.04.2013; the 3rd respondent had requested for issuance of dispatch permits for 10,884 MTS of lime stone which was lying in the mining site; the stock was of lime stone quarried prior to the directions of this Court; and the order of this Court has not been violated.

In her counter affidavit, the 3rd respondent submits that, after receipt of the High Court order, she has stopped quarrying operations in her three quarries. No reply affidavit is filed thereto.

As both respondents 2 and 3 deny violation of the order of this Court aforestated, and in the absence of any affidavit being filed in reply thereto, I see no reason to proceed against them under the Contempt of Courts Act. The Contempt Case is, accordingly, closed.

The Contempt Applications, pending, if any, shall also stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

RAMESH RANGANATHAN, J

21st August 2015.
JSU

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

-

-

-

-

-

-

C.C.No.190 of 2014

—

Date: 21.08.2015

JSU