

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

* * * *

CONTEMPT CASE No.206 OF 2013

—
—

Between:

MAA Socio-Cultural Association, Modameedapalli,
Kothapalli Panchayat, Proddatur Mandal, YSR Kadapa District,
Rep. by its President C. Jaya Linga Reddy

.. Petitioner

And

Sri Janardhan Naidu, and another.

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 24-07-2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

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

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

CONTEMPT CASE No.206 of 2013

—
ORDER:

—

This contempt case is instituted alleging wilful disobedience to
the order dated 16.10.2012 passed by this Court in W.P.No.32608 of

2012.

By the said order, the writ petition was allowed directing the respondent authorities not to interfere with the game of rummy (13 cards game) being played in the premises of the petitioner, whether with or without stakes. The respondent authorities were however given the liberty to enter the premises of the club for taking action in terms of Section 5 of the Andhra Pradesh Gaming Act and to initiate proceedings under Sections 3 and 4 in case of violations of the provisions of the Act.

In the affidavit filed in support of the contempt case, the petitioner alleged that the respondents herein being the Inspector of Police and the Station House Officer attached to Proddatur Rural Police Station,

YSR Kadapa District, came to the club premises on 19.11.2012 and asked them to close down the club. Alleging that this act constituted contempt of the order passed by this Court, the present contempt case was filed.

It is now stated by Sri Y. Kanaka Lingeswara Rao, learned counsel representing Sri K. Rathangapani Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner, that after the institution of this contempt case, there was no interference by the respondent police officials with the lawful activities of the petitioner club.

Recording the said statement, the contempt case is closed. However, it would be open to the petitioner to approach this Court hereinafter in the event there is any wilful disobedience to the directions of this Court. No order as to costs.

JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

24th July, 2015

IBL