

**In the High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad
for the State of Telangana and the State of Andhra
Pradesh**

Contempt Case No.333 of 2015

Between:

Korlakunta Lavanya

... Petitioner

and

–
Mr.Adhar Sinah and another

...Respondent

Date of Judgment Pronounced: 07-08-2015

Submitted for Approval:

The Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
Yes/No
may be allowed to see the judgments ?
2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
Yes/No
marked to Law Reporters/Journals
3. Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to
Yes/No
see the fair copy of the Judgment ?

The Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy

Contempt Case No.333 of 2015

–
Dated 07.08.2015

Between:

Korlakunta Lavanya

... Petitioner

and

–
Mr.Adhar Sinah and another

...Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner: Mr.I.Venkata Prasad

Counsel for the respondents: AGP for Revenue (TS)

The Court made the following:

Order:

This Contempt Case is filed alleging wilful disobedience of Order, dated 21-08-2013, in WP.No.22994 of 2013, by the respondents.

This Court has disposed of the above-mentioned Writ Petition filed by the petitioner herein by placing on record the instructions of the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (Assignments) that as the petitioner's application filed for regularisation of Plot No.200, Ward No.4, Block No.11 of Anmagal Hayatnagar Village, Ranga Reddy District, was found defective, regularisation was not made and that appropriate endorsement in this regard would be issued and communicated to the petitioner within a period of two weeks. Complaining that respondent No.2 has not issued any such

endorsement, the petitioner filed this Contempt Case.

At the hearing, the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue (TS) representing the respondents submitted that in view of interim order, dated 13-12-2013, passed by a Division Bench of this Court in Public Interest Litigation No.517 of 2013, staying regularisation of Government Lands, respondent No.2 could not consider the petitioner's application for regularisation and that Memo, dated 19-03-2015, was issued to that effect to the petitioner.

The learned Counsel for the petitioner has not disputed the abovenoted submission of the learned Assistant Government Pleader.

If the respondents are prevented from considering the applications for regularisation by way of an interim order passed by a Division Bench of this Court, they cannot be found fault with for not disposing of the petitioner's application on merits. The petitioner will have to necessarily await the result of the pending PIL for getting her application disposed of. In this view of the matter, I am of the opinion that the respondents have not committed any contempt.

Hence, the Contempt Case is dismissed.

As a sequel to closure of the Contempt Case,

Application No.204 of 2015, filed by the petitioner for interim relief, is disposed of as infructuous.

(C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy, J)

Dt: 7th August, 2015
LUR