

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1845 OF 2015

Dated:29.11.2017

Between:


Smt. A. M. Vijaya Ranimani,
W/o. M.R. Chary, rep., by her G.P.A.
Holder Smt. N. Vasantha Kumari,
W/o. Satyanarayana, aged 75 years,
R/o.D.No.19-6/20/B3, STV Nagar,
Tirupati Town and Urban Mandal,
Chittoor District

.. Petitioner

And

Smt. Y.V. Anuradha, Commissioner
of Endowments, Andhra Pradesh,
Hyderabad and another

.. Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1845 OF 2015

ORDER:

By order dated 22.09.2014, W.P.No.24531 of 2014 was disposed of. The operative portion of the order reads as under:

“... The writ petition is disposed of directing the Sub Registrar, Tirupati Urban, Tirupati, Chittoor District (3rd respondent) to receive and process the deed of conveyance concerning the said property and as and when such document is presented by the petitioner, the same shall be received in accordance with Indian Registration Act, 1908 and Indian Stamp Act, 1899 without reference to the reflection of the said land as belonging to the religious and charitable institution and the deed of conveyance if otherwise in order, shall be registered and released to the parties. There shall be no order as to costs.”

2. Alleging violation of the directions issued by this Court, this Contempt Case is filed.

3. The direction of this Court was to the 3rd respondent, Sub-Registrar, to receive and process the deed of conveyance concerning the subject property as and when such document is presented by the petitioner. Thus, the primary requirement for compliance of the direction of this Court was for the petitioner to present the document. No material is filed to show that neither the document was presented by the petitioner nor the Sub-Registrar refused to receive the same.

4. On the contrary, a reading of the averments at paragraph No.4 of the counter affidavit would disclose that the petitioner expressed grievance against the revenue authorities in not taking action to send the revised communication deleting the subject land

from the list of prohibited lands for registration. In other words, according to the petitioner, he is waiting for the revenue authorities to delete the subject property from the list of prohibited properties. It appears from the averments in the affidavit that the document is not even presented before the Sub-Registrar. Therefore, the allegation that the Sub-Registrar has committed contempt of the order passed by this Court is baseless.

5. The Contempt Case is accordingly dismissed with costs of Rs.1,000/- (Rupees one thousand only) to be paid to the High Court Legal Services Committee.

Date:29.11.2017

KH

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

