

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE NO.2047 of 2015

Date: 08.08.2016

Between :

B. Krishna Reddy s/o. Bal Reddy, Aged about 54 years,
Occu: Business, r/o. B-201, B.K.Road, Ameerpet,
Hyderabad.

.... Petitioner

And

Shri B.R.Meena, State of A.P., rep. by the Principal
Secretary to Government, Revenue Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and two others.

.... Respondents

This Court made the following :

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

-

CONTEMPT CASE NO.2047 of 2015

ORDER :

This Court passed the following interim order in W.P.No.11298 of 2014, dated 21.04.2014.

“Hence, there shall be an interim direction not to dispossess the petitioner from the land to an extent of Ac.1.03 guntas in SurveyNo.325/2 of Shankerpally Village and Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, until further orders.”

2. Counter affidavit is filed on behalf of the 3rd respondent. It is averred in paragraphs 10 and 11, which reads as under:

“10. The petitioner failed to attend the office and receive the compensation. The lands have been taken possession and handed over to the requisition department under the cover of panchanama on 09.04.2014.

11. The Hon’ble High Court have issued orders that there shall be an interim direction not to dispossess the petitioner from the land to an extent of Ac.1.03 gts in Sy.No.325/2 of Shankarpally village and Mandal, Ranga Reddy district until further orders vide orders in W.P.no.11298/2014 dated 21.04.2014. this office has taken possession of the lands including the petitioner’s land under the cover of panchanama on 09.04.2014 and handed over to the Requisitioning Department on 09.04.2014 which is much prior to the date of the orders passed by this Hon’ble High Court. The orders of the Hon’ble High Court has been received in this office on 13.06.2014.”

3. In view of the categorical assertion of the 3rd respondent that possession was taken on 09.04.2014, much prior to the interim orders passed by this Court, it cannot be said that respondents deliberately and wilfully violated the orders of this Court.

4. At this stage, learned counsel for petitioner sought to

contend that conducting of panchanama to take possession is also not properly done and due procedure is not followed. This matter requires consideration by the Writ Court. No further orders can be passed on this issue claimed by the petitioner. It is open to the petitioner to contest the stand of the respondent regarding possession also. Contempt Case is closed.

Miscellaneous petitions if any pending shall stand dismissed.

No costs.

JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

Date: 08.08.2016

kkm

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

-

Contempt Case No.2047 of 2015

Date: 08.08.2016

kkm