

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE No.2288 of 2014

Date:06.02.2015

Between:

Pulagam Parasuramudu,
S/o Late P.Venkaiah
and three others.

.....
Petitioners

And:

Bhaskar Katamneni, District Collector
West Godavari District.

...Respondent

Counsel for the Petitioners: Sri B.Chandrsekhar

Counsel for the Respondent: GP for Revenue (Andhra Pradesh)

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

This Contempt Case is filed alleging willful disobedience of order, dated 24.07.2013, in Writ Petition No.21314 of 2013.

The petitioners herein have filed Writ Petition No.21314 of 2013 to set aside proceedings, dated 12.07.2013, issued by respondent No.3 therein-Tahsildar, Palakoderu Mandal, directing eviction of the

petitioners from their residential houses bearing Nos.6-214, 6-214/1, 6-214/2 and 6-214/3 situated in Survey No.205 of Gollelakoderu Gram Panchayat, Palakoderu Mandal, West Godavari District.

Vide, order, dated 24.07.2013, considering the fact that the petitioners are in possession of the Government land and that the land was required for road widening, this Court while declining to interfere with the eviction order, however, permitted the petitioners to make a representation to the respondent herein for payment of compensation towards the value of the structures raised by them, and directed the respondent herein to entertain such representations and take a decision thereon in the light of the Government Orders in force within two months from the date of receipt of such representations and further directed him to permit the petitioners to remain in possession of their respective structures for a period of four weeks to enable them to secure alternative accommodation.

The petitioners are stated to have made representations to the respondent for payment of compensation. Purporting to consider those representations, the respondent has issued proceedings vide D.Dis.No.E2/5566/2013, dated 05.11.2014, whereby he has rejected the request of the petitioners for payment of compensation to the structures constructed by them.

From the above-noted undisputed facts, it is clear that the respondent has taken a decision on the representations of the petitioners and communicated the same to the latter. However, if at all the respondent has violated the order of this Court, it is only with respect to non-adherence to the time limit stipulated by this Court while disposing of the Writ Petition.

On the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not intend to take a serious note of this lapse on the part of the respondent. Hence, the Contempt Case is closed with a caution to the respondent to be careful in future in adhering to the time limit stipulated by this Court. The petitioners are left free to avail appropriate remedy if they feel aggrieved by rejection of their claim for payment of compensation.

*JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA
REDDY*

*06th February, 2015
DR*