

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE No.239 of 2015

Date:20.02.2015

Between:

Kota Venkata Prasad Rao,
S/o Subba Rao

..... Petitioner

And:

Y.V.Anuradha,
Commissioner of Endowments,
Hyderabad and another.

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner: Sri S.V.Ramana

Counsel for the Respondents: ---

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

This Contempt Case is filed alleging willful disobedience of order, dated 14.02.2011, in WPMP.No.42208 of 2010 in Writ Petition No.33268 of 2010.

A perusal of the above-mentioned order shows that when certain sale deeds were sought to be submitted by the petitioners therein in respect of parts of land out of Acs.4.84 cents in Survey Nos.365/2, etc of Pamur Village and Mandal, Prakasam District, respondent No.2 has not entertained the same. In the light of the said grievance, this Court has passed the

interim direction to entertain the sale deeds submitted by the petitioners therein.

It is the pleaded case of the petitioner that in pursuance of the said order, the sale deeds submitted by him were entertained and the same were registered. The grievance of the petitioner in the Contempt Case is that when fresh sale deeds were sought to be presented in respect of a part of balance land of Acs.4.84 cents, respondent No.2 has refused to entertain the same.

In my opinion, the above-mentioned interim order granted by this Court is confined to the sale deeds already submitted or sought to be submitted by the petitioners therein and to the extent of those sale deeds, respondent Nos.2 has already complied with the said interim order of this Court. If respondent No.2 has refused to entertain the sale deeds sought to be submitted much after the passing of the above-mentioned interim order, such an action is not amenable to contempt jurisdiction. Refusal to entertain the fresh sale deeds, other than those which are subject matter of the interim order passed in the above-mentioned Writ Petition, gives rise to a fresh cause of action for the petitioner.

In this view of the matter, the Contempt Case is wholly misconceived and the same is, accordingly, dismissed, however, with liberty to the petitioner to avail a fresh appropriate remedy if he feels aggrieved by the refusal to entertain fresh sale deeds by respondent No.2.

*JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA
REDDY*

20th February, 2015
DR