

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

CONTEMPT CASE NO.1618 OF 2013

ORDER:

The order of this Court, violation of which resulted in the present Contempt Case being filed, required the respondents not to dispossess the petitioner from the subject land, except in accordance with law after putting her on notice and giving her an opportunity of being heard.

The present Contempt Case is filed alleging that the respondents were seeking to forcibly dispossess the petitioner from the subject land. While initially a counter affidavit was filed denying the petitioner's possession, an additional counter affidavit is now filed by the third respondent stating that the total extent of land in Survey No.42 is Acs.102.10 gts which is Sarkari Government land; out of the above, an extent of Acs.3.30 gts of land has been assigned to Sri Irikilla Chokkaiah and he continued as assignee/pattedar upto 1982-83; during the year 1983-84, the patta was transferred in favour of his legal heirs, Irikilla Mallaiah, Venkati, Shivaiah and Lingaiah for an extent of Acs.3.17 ½ gts, and an extent of Ac.0.12 ½ gts of land was transferred in favour of Madugula Pochaiah; they continued as pattedar upto 1997-98; on verification of pahani for the year 1998-99, it is evident that an extent of Acs.3.17 ½ gts and 0.12 ½ gts were shown as Kharz Khata in the revenue records; the husband of the petitioner has purchased the assigned land from the assignees Irikilla Mallaiah, Venkati, Shivaiah and Lingaiah through registered sale deed dated 08.08.1973; an extent of Acs.5.00 of land was assigned to the fourth respondent i.e., an extent of Acs.2.00 in Survey No.64 and an extent of Acs.3.00 in Naspur Village, Mancherla Mandal; and the land assigned to the fourth respondent, and the land purchased by the petitioner, are shown in the enclosed location map.

As it is now stated that the assigned land, which the petitioner's husband had purchased, is different from the land allotted to the fourth respondent, it is evident that the respondents have not violated the order of this Court. I see no reason, therefore, to proceed against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

The Contempt Case is, accordingly, closed.

(RAMESH RANGANATHAN, J)

10th April 2015

RRB