

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

Contempt Case No.2093 of 2017

ORDER :

1. This Contempt Case is filed alleging violation of interim order passed by this Court in WP No.20911 of 2016 on 29.06.2016, which was extended from time to time and finally extended until further orders in WPMP No.25651 of 2016 in WP No.20911 of 2016 on 19.07.2016.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that the father of the petitioner was granted 'D' Form patta by the Tahsildar, Guntur on 21.05.1974 for an extent of Ac.0.66 cents of land in Sy.No.392, Atmakur Village, Mangalagiri Mandal, Guntur District. He was in possession of the same and cultivating the land till his death on 10.11.2004 and that after his death, petitioner has been cultivating the same. Petitioner came to know that the Government decided to grant on lease the land in Sy.No.392 including the land of the petitioner for locating the Telugu Desam (Political) party office. As the TDP (political party) made an application for grant of land on lease, a notice was put up in the Atmakur Gram Panchayat Office, Mandal Parishad office, Mangalagiri and the office of the Tahsildar, Mangalagiri in Rc.No.297/2016, dated 24.03.2016 by the Tahsildar, Mangalagiri Mandal, notifying that the Telugu Desam Party

has applied for an extent of Ac.5.00 in Sy.No.392 in Atmakur Village for construction of party office and called for objections. Petitioner submitted objections on 01.04.2016 to the Tahsildar, Mangalagiri Mandal stating the aforesaid facts. He also submitted a copy of representation to the District Collector and Panchayat Secretary, Atmakur Gram Panchayat. When the revenue officials pressurizing the petitioner to handover the subject land to the Government, petitioner filed W.P.No.20911 of 2016 and this Court granted order of *status quo* on 29.06.2016 and same was extended until further orders on 19.07.2016. When the interim order is subsisting, the respondent issued notice in Rc.No.566/2016-DT, dated 17.10.2016 asking the petitioner to show-cause in writing within 15 days why the said land cannot be taken possession of. Petitioner gave reply to the said notice on 23.10.2016 through his counsel cautioning the respondent that the aforesaid notice issued by her amounts to violation of interim order passed by this Court and amounts to Contempt of Court. When the petitioner cleared the land and prepared it for raising maize and red gram, in the intervening night between 1st and 2nd July, 2017, the respondent along with some persons erected tin sheets as a wall to block entry into the land of the petitioner and that they have also removed the barbed wire fencing put up by

the petitioner and prevented the petitioner from cultivating the land. Hence, the respondent has committed Contempt of Court by willfully violating the orders passed by this Court and seeks to punish the respondent.

3. Counter affidavit is filed by the respondent denying the allegations in the affidavit filed in support of the Contempt Case stating that the petitioner is claiming the land in Sy.No.392-5, but as per the record, Sy.No.392-5 to an extent of Acs.2.20 cents is NH-16 (National High Way-16) and that the said land in Sy.No.392-5 was taken for formation of National Highway in the year 1983 and that the petitioner has approached this Court after a long lapse of 34 years. As per the RSR of Atmakuru village of Mangalagiri Mandal, Sy.No.392 to an extent of Acs.10.81 cents is classified as Vagu Poramboke, as such, the subject land is under the possession of the Government and also that there is no cultivation over the subject land. That the father of the petitioner was an Ex.Village Munsiff of Atmakuru village and while so, he occupied the subject land illegally and obtained patta to an extent of Acs.0.6 in Sy.No.392. That as per BSO, there is no procedure or condition to allot the land temporarily subject to conversion and that such a patta is nothing but a nullity in the eye of law and the same is unenforceable. That the then Tahsildar by proceedings dated 24.05.1993 cancelled the patta of the

petitioner's father on the ground that the land was sold away by converting the land into plots and assailing the same, the petitioner filed appeal before the Revenue Divisional Officer and same was allowed on 06.09.1997. That when the survey conducted by the surveyors, it is found that the subject land is vacant, a notice (A1) was published by the Tahsildar, Mangalagiri vide Rc.No.297/2016-DT, dated 24.03.2016 notifying that Telugu Desam Party has applied for an extent of Acs.5.00 cents in Sy.No.392 in Atmakur village for construction of party office and called for objections. When the petitioner filed objections to the same, they have verified the revenue records and found that the land to an extent of Acs.10.81 cents is classified as Vagu Poramboke in Sy.No.392 and was not converted into AWD and no permanent DK pattas were sanctioned. When the petitioner filed representation before the CCLA, Gollapudi, Vijayawada, the same as forwarded to the District Collector, Guntur to examine the same and take action as per rules. After conducting detailed enquiry, it is found that the petitioner is not residing in Atmakuru village; that he does not have any ration card and his name was not included in the voter's list of Atmakuru village since 2004; that he is not a landless poor and also not eligible for any benefits of assignment of land from the Government. Subsequently, a notice dated

17.10.2016 was issued to the petitioner to produce documentary evidence and that instead of producing documentary evidence, the petitioner issued legal notice on 23.10.2016 denying the aforesaid facts. The father of the petitioner is not entitled for grant of patta as he is having other landed properties. In pursuant to G.O.Ms.No.228 Revenue (Assignment-IV) Department, dated 22.06.2017, the District Collector, Guntur issued orders vide proceedings in Rc.No.646/17-E1, dated 23.06.2017 with a direction to the Tahsildar, Mangalagiri to handover the possession of the land measuring to an extent of Acs.3.65 cents in Sy.No.392-1 to an extent of Ac.0.13 cents in Sy.No.392-3 to an extent of Ac.0.64 cents, in Sy.No.392-4 to an extent of Ac.1.80 cents, in Sy.No.392-8 to an extent of Ac.0.74 cents, in Sy.No.392-9 to an extent of Ac.0.27 cents and in Sy.No.392-10 to an extent of Ac.0.07 cents of Atmakuru village of Mangalagiri Mandal to the lessee, after collecting the total lease rent of the land which amounts to Rs.3,650/- and that the possession was handed over to the TDP party for construction of office building. The tin sheets were erected to the land, which was allotted to the construction of TDP State Party office. That the subject is covered under Section 22-A (1)(b) of Registration Act, 1908 and the same has already been published in Annexure-II of prohibited list of Atmakuru village of Mangalagiri Mandal.

Since the petitioner is not in possession and enjoyment of the land in Sy.No.392/5 since long time, question of taking away the petitioner's land does not arise, as such, she prays to close the Contempt Case.

4. Additional counter affidavit is filed by the respondent stating that as per Form-D patta submitted by the petitioner, the land was assigned to the father of the petitioner to an extent of Ac.0.66 cents in Sy.No.392, but not in Sy.No.392/5 as alleged by the petitioner. That the land to an extent of Acs.10.81 cents in Sy.No.392 is classified as Vagu Poramboke and that out of said extent of Acs.2.20 cents was taken by the National Highways Authority and formed National Highway-5 in the year 1984 renamed as NH.16 road and no assignment was made in favour of anyone at any point of time. It is stated that by the time of alleged assignment, the land in Sy.No.392 is not sub-divided and the same as sub-divided in the year 2017 only. The photographs filed by the petitioner showing that he is cultivating the agricultural land are fabricated one and does not belong to the land in issue.

5. Reply affidavits are filed by the petitioner denying the averments in the counter and additional counter affidavits and reiterated the averments in the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition and Contempt Case along with relevant

correspondence to prove the contempt case against respondent.

6. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Revenue appearing for the respondent.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner is in possession and enjoyment of the subject land and in spite of granting of *status quo* orders until further orders on 19.07.2016, the respondent got issued show-cause notice dated 17.10.2016 asking the petitioner to submit explanation as to why the subject land cannot be taken possession of, which is in violation of orders passed by this Court and the respondent is liable for punishment.

8. On the other hand, learned Government Pleader for Revenue appearing for the respondent while reiterating the averments in the counter and additional counter affidavits, tried to justify the actions of the respondent stating that the land claimed by the petitioner is in Sy.No.392/5 of Atmakuru Village, but as per the available revenue records, the land in Sy.No.392/5 has been taken for the formation of National Highway No.5 (renamed as NH-16) in the year 1983 itself and that the petitioner has approached this Court after long lapse of time i.e., after 34 years; that the subject land is in possession of the Government and same

is recorded under Section 22-A(1)(b) of the Registration Act, 1908.

9. Now the point that arises for consideration is whether the respondent has violated the orders passed by this Court? If so, whether the said action amounts to willful disobedience?

10. Before considering the rival contentions of both parties, it is necessary to extract Sections 2(a) & (b) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (for short 'the Act').

"2(a) 'contempt of court' means civil contempt or criminal contempt;

2(b): "civil contempt" means willful disobedience to any judgment, decree, direction, order, writ or other process of a court or willful breach of an undertaking given to a court."

It is well settled law that mere disobedience of an order made in a proceeding may not be sufficient to amount to a 'civil contempt' within the meaning of Section 2(b) of the Act and that the element of willingness is an indispensable requirement to bring home the accusation of contempt within the meaning of the Act. Section 12 of the Act deals with the contempt of Court and its punishment. Civil contempt would be willful breach of an undertaking given to the court or willful disobedience of any judgment or order of the court. The act of disobedience and the attendant circumstances are

relevant to consider whether a case would fall under civil contempt or criminal contempt.

11. The arguments advanced by both parties have to be examined basing on the material produced by both parties. Learned Government Pleader for revenue submits that the petitioner is claiming land in Sy.No.392/5 of Atmakuru village, but as per records, the land to an extent of Acs.2.20 cents in Sy.No.392/5 was taken for formation of road for National High No.5 (renamed as NH 16) in the year 1983 itself. The said submission of the learned Government Pleader appears to be false and incorrect for more than one reason. When one M/s.Lingamaneni Estates Private Ltd., submitted representation dated 19.04.2005 to the District Collector, Guntur seeking permission to make a way through the Government Poramboke covered by Sy.No.392 of Atmakuru Village, Mangalagiri Mandal, so as to form approach road from National Highway, the Mandal Revenue Officer replied to the Executive Director of the said company by his endorsement signed on 12.08.2005 stating that there was no vacant vagu poramboke land available in Sy.No.392 of Atmakur village for allotment in his favour for road formation as requested by him because an extent of Ac.4.05 cents was allotted long back in favour of three encroachers for cultivation purpose in

the said survey number whose encroachments are not objectionable and transfer proposals are under progress. Though it is stated that an extent of 0.65 cents is set apart for Vagu course, the said extent of 0.65 cents of land set apart for vagu course is in Sy.No.392/2, but not in Sy.No.392/5 of Atmakuru village, which is evident from the letter addressed by the Mandal Revenue Officer, Mangalagiri to the Collector, Guntur on 12.08.2005 vide L.Dis.No.416/2005-A. In the said report, it is also made it clear that the land to an extent of Ac.0.65 cents in Sy.No.392/5 belongs to Bommu Rami Reddy, who is the father of the petitioner and the land to an extent of 0.65 cents in sy.No.392/2 as vagu course and the land to an extent of Ac.2.20 cents in Sy.No.392/6 for NH-5, named as NH-16, as stated by the respondent in her counter affidavit. Therefore, the contention of the learned Government Pleader that the land claimed by the petitioner falls under Sy.No.392/5 to an extent of Ac.2.20 cents is NH-16 is false and incorrect and created only for the purpose of defeating the rights of the petitioner over the subject land and also to overcome this Contempt Case.

12. Learned Government Pleader for revenue basing on counter affidavit submits that the land in Sy.No.392 of Atmakuru village, Mangalagiri Mandal was subdivided

only in the year 2017, but not previously, as alleged by the petitioner. He submits that there is no office file number and sub-division number on the Xerox copy of Form-D patta submitted by the petitioner as No.260/93 and sy.No.392 to an extent of 0.66 cents and that no entries were found in the revenue records that the land was converted into AWD and also that no pattadar pass books were issued to the petitioner till date and name of the petitioner is nowhere reflected in the Adangals and 1B registers and that there is no evidence to show that the petitioner is in possession of the subject land. In order to rebut the said contentions, petitioner filed reply affidavit along with following material papers. When the Collector, Guntur directed to submit the remarks of the RDO, Guntur for transfer of land to AWD for assignment purpose, the Revenue Divisional Officer, Guntur submitted a report to the Collector, Guntur vide Rc.No.223/2004-A, dated 22.06.2005 stating as follows:

“2. In regard to point 2, it was pointed out that the Mandal Revenue officer, Mangalagiri reported that D.Form patta was given, whereas the Revenue Divisional Officer stated in his report that temporary patta was given (para 3 line 3)

In this connection I submit that in the report of the Mandal Revenue Officer, Mangalagiri in Rc No.88/2002-A, dated 29.11.2003 in the 2nd para reported that Sri Bommu Ramireddy s/o.Kotireddy of Atmakur village of Mangalagiri Mandal was granted D.Form Patta to an extent of Ac.0.66 in S.No.392 of Atmakur village under Dk.No.260/F/1383, dated 21.05.1974 by the then Tahsildar. In the same report, the Mandal Revenue Officer further reported that the then Mandal Revenue Officer, Mangalagiri observed that Sri Bommu Ramireddy has obtained temporary patta to an extent of Ac.0.66 subject to conversion (copy enclosed) basing on the

report of the Mandal Revenue Officer, Mangalagiri, it has been reported. I found that Sri Bommu Ramireddy was granted D Form patta by the then Tahsildar, Guntur in the year 1974 (copy enclosed).

In regard to point 4, it was pointed out that the Revenue Divisional Officer, Guntur will not be the appellate authority and the matter would have been referred to the Collector by the R.D.O, Guntur. In this connection, I offer no remarks as the then R.D.O., guntur taken the matter on appeal and passed orders in R.Dis.No.671/94-A, dated 06.09.1977 and allowed the appeal (copy enclosed).

The Mandal Revenue Officer, Mangalagiri in the reference 3rd cited submitted his further report direct to the Collector, Guntur.

In view of the above circumstances explained above, the encroacher is cultivating the land since a long time, hence the case may be considered for assignment on payment of market value as already reported in this office reference 1st cited. “

In the application for transfer of vagu poramboke to AWD, the Revenue Divisional Officer, Guntur, in the proceedings dated 20.12.2004, it is stated as follows:

“Reasons for Mandal Revenue Officer: The land Ac.0.65 cents sub divided as S.No.392/5 is under the physical possession and enjoyment of Sri B.Ramireddy S/o.Kotireddy for the last 30 years and above and it is an unobjectionable encroachment A1 notice was published and no objections received. The Gram Panchayat has given consent vide resolution No.90 dated 27.10.1998. Being the land located besides NH5 Road, it is valuable and only can be assigned on payment of market value imposing certain conditions that the land is to be used by the grantee for agriculture purpose only.”

Even in the inspection notice, dated 19.12.2004, it is observed by the Revenue Divisional Officer as follows:

“Because of its location adjoining the NH.5, it is of special value and prime land. Since the land under subject was assigned on 21.05.1974 in favour of Sri Bommi Ramireddy, S/o.Kotireddy without conversion of the land from vagu poramboke to Assessed Waste and as the land is under his enjoyment since a long time after assignment was made, the already assigned land has to be converted.”

In the statement of subdivisions in the village of Atmakuru Mandal, Guntur District, the name of the father of the petitioner i.e., Bommu Rami Reddy S/o.Koti Reddy is mentioned in the registered holders column

stating that he is in possession of 0.65 cents in Sy.No.392/5 of Atmakur Village and the land to an extent of Ac.2.20 cents is shown as NH5 in Sy.No.392/6. As per the sketch prepared by the respondent, there are ten subdivisions in Sy.No.392 of Atmakur Village, but as per the report submitted by the MRO, Mangalagiri Mandal to the Collector, Guntur District on 12.08.2005, there are only eight subdivisions in Sy.No.392 of Atmakuru village. It is not known on what basis the respondent has prepared the said sketch and submitted before this Court. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner has placed the aforesaid proceedings before this Court, the same were not answered by the respondent in her counter affidavit. Even if the contentions of the learned Government Pleader are considered to be true, it is not explained as to why the MRO has submitted report to the District Collector, Guntur on 12.08.2005 giving details about the land in sy.No.392 of Atmakur Village. In the said report, it is stated as follows:

“But Survey No.392 of Atmakur village measuring Acs.10-81 cents which was classified as vagu poramboke was covered by considerable encroachments as shown as below and transfer proposals have also been initiated and they are in process at Collectorate as well as with the Government.

Survey No.	Extent	
392/1	Ac.1.27	Kolla Raghu Rghava Rao
392/2	Ac.0.65	Vagu course
392/3	Ac.1.70	Kolla Raghu Raghava Rao
392/4	Ac.1.70	Kolla Bhaskara Rao

392/5	Ac.0.65	Bommu Rami Reddy
392/6	Ac.2.20	NH5 road
392/7	Ac.1.00	Hanuman Nagar (Houses by Pr.Road margin encroachers)
392/8	Ac.2.81	Vagu Poramboke

Out of the above, sub-divisions 392/7, 8 are located on Eastern side to NH5 road and sub divisions 392/1 to 5 are located on western side to NH5 road. Survey Nos.392/2, 8 are set apart for vague course. Survey No.392/6 is left for NH5 road formation.

Now the petitioner's request is concerned to the part of land in survey No.392 that was located on western side to NH5 road i.e., sub divisions S.No.392/1, 3, 4 and 5 which are under the long standing encroachment of 3 persons (1) Kolla Bhaskara Rao (2) Kolla Raghu Raghava Rao & (3) Bommu Umamaheshwara Reddy S/o.late Rami Reddy, who were allotted under D form subject to conversion from Vagu poramboke to AW Dry. Serial Nos.1 and 2 were given in 1993 and Sl.No.3 was given in 1974. The transfer proposals are in process in Collector's office. The connected file Nos. are C.No.319/2005-E2 and C.No.1808/2005-E2.

In the additional counter affidavit, it is categorically stated by the respondent that the entire extent of Ac.10.81 cents was entered in the list of prohibitory properties under Section 22-A of the Registration Act and that by the time of the alleged assignment, the land in Sy.No.392 is not sub-divided and the same was sub-divided in the year 2017 only. It is evident from the aforesaid proceedings that the father of the petitioner has been granted D-form patta in the year 1974 and he is in possession and enjoyment of the subject till his death and after his death, the petitioner is in possession of the same and that their names are also entered in revenue records. Therefore, this Court is of the opinion that averments in the counter and additional counter are utter falsehood and they have been made without verifying the records.

13. Learned Government Pleader for revenue basing on counter affidavit submits that the land to an extent of Ac.2.20 cents in Sy.No.392-5 is acquired for the formation of NH-5 (renamed as NH-16). As per the letter of the MRO dated 12.08.2005, the land in Sy.No.392/6 is acquired for the formation of NH5, but not in Sy.No.392-5 for formation of NH16. Even if said submission is to be construed as true, the respondent should have produced the record pertaining to the said acquisition for formation of NH-16. Except filing a sketch, the respondent has not produced any material showing that the land to an extent of Ac.2.20 in Sy.No.392/5 acquired for the purpose of formation of NH 16 in the year 1983 itself. Even if the submission of the learned Government Pleader that the subject land is a government land and is in possession of the Government, then what prompted the respondent for issuing show-cause notice dated 17.10.2016 asking to petitioner to show-cause as to why the possession of the subject land cannot be taken within 15 days from that day, that too, after filing of the writ petition by the petitioner and after granting of order of status quo, until further orders on 19.07.2016. When once the subject land was assigned in favour of the father of the petitioner in the year 1974, as observed supra, it cannot be said that the subject land is in possession of the Government. Both the submissions of the learned

Government Pleader are contradictory to each other. When once the status quo order is operating until further orders, the question of issuing show-cause notice by the petitioner is nothing but violation of interim orders passed by this Court.

13. Be it as it may, in the counter affidavit is stated that the then Tahsildar by proceedings dated 24.05.1993 cancelled the patta of the petitioner's father on the ground that the land was sold away by converting the land into plots. Assailing the said order, the father of the petitioner filed appeal before the Revenue Divisional officer, which was allowed on 06.09.1997. No revision is filed by the respondent challenging the aforesaid order dated 06.09.1997. Therefore, it can be presumed, even as per the above pleadings of the respondent in the counter affidavit, the order of the R.D.O has become final, as such, the father of the petitioner was in possession till his death, by virtue of patta granted on 21.05.1974 and after his the death, petitioner is in possession and enjoyment of the subject land. The statements of the learned Government Pleader in this regard are quite contradictory to each other. Even if the subject land is included in the list of Government lands under Section 22-A (1)(b) of the Registration Act, 1908, the respondent cannot violate status quo order passed by this Court.

14. Though it is averred in the counter affidavit that the petitioner is not residing in Atmakur Village; that he does not have any ration card; that his name is not included in the voters' list of Atmakuru Village since 2004; that he is not a landless poor and that he is not eligible for any benefits of assignment of land from the Government, cannot be decided in this contempt case. However, the electricity bills and house tax receipts filed by the petitioner shows that he is in possession and enjoyment of the subject land till date.

15. Though in the counter affidavit it is specifically stated that the respondent has not violated the orders passed by this Court, but the facts and circumstances discussed above are otherwise. Though the father of the petitioner and after his demise, the petitioner is in possession and enjoyment of the subject land since 1974 and their names are also entered in revenue records, same are being falsified by the statements made by the respondent in the counter as well as additional counter affidavits.

16. It is pertinent to note that the respondent has issued impugned show-cause notice dated 17.10.2016 in view of the representations dated 17.09.2016 and 21.09.2016. But in the reply affidavit, it is categorically denied the said assertions made in the counter affidavit. It is categorically

stated in the reply affidavit filed by the petitioner that after receiving legal notice dated 23.10.2016, the respondent has committed second violation on 02.07.2017 by erecting tin sheets to prevent the entry of petitioner into his land. The said assertion is not rebutted by the respondent. From the facts narrated above, it is apparent that the attitude of the respondent is without any doubt defiant and contemptuous. It is clear from the conduct of the respondent that she has no regard for the orders passed by this Court.

17. In **Maninderjit Singh Bitta v. Union of India**¹ the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while deprecating the attitude of the respondents-government officials in implementing the orders passed by this Court, held as follows:

26. In exercise of its contempt jurisdiction, the courts are primarily concerned with enquiring whether the contemnor is guilty of intentional and wilful violation of the orders of the court, even to constitute a civil contempt. Every party to lis before the court, and even otherwise, is expected to obey the orders of the court in its true spirit and substance. Every person is required to respect and obey the orders of the court with due dignity for the institution. The Government Departments are no exception to it. The departments or instrumentalities of the State must act expeditiously as per orders of the court and if such orders postulate any schedule, then it must be adhered to. Whenever there are obstructions or difficulties in compliance with the orders of the court, least that is expected of the Government Department or its functionaries is to approach the court for extension of time or clarifications, if called for. But, where the party neither obeys the orders of the court nor approaches the court making appropriate prayers for extension of time or variation of order, the only possible inference in law is that such party disobeys the orders of the court. In other words, it is intentionally not carrying out the orders of the court. Flagrant violation of the court's orders would reflect the attitude of the concerned party to undermine the authority of the courts, its dignity and the administration of justice.

¹ (2012) 1 Supreme Court Cases 273

27. It is where the State and its instrumentalities have failed to discharge its statutory functions or have acted adversely to the larger public interest that the courts are called upon to interfere in exercise of their extraordinary jurisdiction, to ensure maintenance of the rule of law. These are the cases which have impact in rem or on larger section of the society and not in personam simplicitor. Courts are called upon to exercise jurisdiction with twin objects in mind. Firstly, to punish the persons who have disobeyed or not carried out orders of the court i.e. for their past conduct. Secondly, to pass such orders, including imprisonment and use the contempt jurisdiction as a tool for compliance of its orders in future. This principle has been applied in the United States and Australia as well.”

The facts and circumstances narrated above would clearly show that the respondent in utter disregard to the orders of this Court, willfully violated the same. In order to overcome the contempt proceedings, she has misled the court by creating false records, without verifying the original records available in the department. The apology tendered by her in the affidavit is a mere pretence and in a routine manner, does not deserve any sympathy, since the subsequent events even after admission of the contempt case disclose the continuous disobedience to the order of the Court. The disobedience is so serious and patent, leaves this court with no option except to punish the respondent for committing contempt of Court.

For all the foregoing discussions and conclusions, this Court, holding the respondent is guilty of contempt of this Court under [Section 2\(b\)](#) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with [Article 215](#) of the Constitution of India, hereby sentences her to undergo simple imprisonment for a period of one month. Taking into

account the ordeal faced by the petitioner in this case, this Court is also inclined to impose fine of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand only) payable to the petitioner from her pocket, within a period of three weeks, in default to undergo further imprisonment for two weeks.

Accordingly, the contempt petition stands disposed of. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Contempt Case, shall stand closed.

10-04-2018
kvs



A.RAJASHEKER REDDY, J

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

Contempt Case No.2093 OF 2017



kvs