

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1708 OF 2017

DATED : 13.11.2017

Between :

Madala Sujatha Sivani W/o.M.Pratap,
Aged about 44 yrs, R/o.D.No.5-92-39/2,
Devapuram, 3rd Lane, Guntur-2,
State of Andhra Pradesh.

.. Petitioner

And

Sri Kona Seshidha, I.A.S,
The District Collector,
Guntur District, Guntur,
State of Andhra Pradesh

Respondent



This court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1708 OF 2017

ORDER :

According to the petitioner, aggrieved by inclusion of property claimed by the petitioner as belonging to her in the list of prohibited properties under the Indian Registration Act (for short 'the Act'), she submitted a representation on 05.02.2015 to the District Collector Guntur. Alleging inaction on the said representation W.P.No.1079 of 2016 was filed.

2. The writ petition was disposed of directing the District Collector, Guntur to consider the representation of the petitioner in accordance with the directions of the Full Bench and to issue appropriate consequential proceedings intimating the petitioner accordingly.

3. The District Collector issued endorsement on 18.09.2017, a copy of which is enclosed to the counter affidavit, which would disclose that in exercise of power under Section 22-A of the Act, notification was issued by the Government prohibiting registration of properties mentioned therein, under Section 22-A (1) (e) of the Act, including the property claimed by the petitioner.

4. According to the Full Bench judgment of this Court in ***"Vinjamuri Rajagopala Chary Vs State of Andhra Pradesh¹"*** the State level Committee has to consider the grievance against such inclusion.

¹ 2016 (1) ALT (550) (F.B)

5. Having regard to the directions issued by the Full Bench of this Court and the consequential orders of the Government, the District Collector, reported to the Commissioner of Survey, Settlements and Land Records and Convenor of State Level Grievances Redressal Committee.

6. Thus, it cannot be said that there is violation of the directions of this Court much less deliberate and willful.

7. Having regard to the time limit fixed by the Court and the delay in passing the order, the respondent-Collector tendered unconditional apology. The apology is accepted and the contempt case is accordingly closed, leaving it open to the petitioner to prosecute her grievance with the State Level Redressal Committee. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this contempt case shall stand closed.

13th November 2017
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J