

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

**CONTEMPT CASE No.2413 OF 2017**

**DATED : 05.01.2018**

Between :

Challagulla Subrahmanyaswara Rao,  
S/o.Venkanna, Aged about 49 yrs,  
D.No.15/191, S.N.Puram,  
Occu : Agriculturist, D.No.15/191,  
S.N.Puram, Gudivada 521301,  
Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh

.. Petitioner

And

M.Chakrapani S/o.Not known to petitioner,  
Major, Mandal Tahsildar,  
Mudinepalli Mandal, Krishna District.

.. Respondents



This court made the following :

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

**CONTEMPT CASE No.2413 OF 2017**

**ORDER :**

This Court, by order dated 03.10.2017 in W.P.M.P.No.40872 of 2017 in W.P.No.32858 of 2017, directed the respondents to consider the application of the petitioner, dated 16.08.2017, for conversion of his agricultural land to non-agricultural purpose with reference to the objections already raised and to pass orders. Alleging violation of the said directions, this Contempt Case is filed.

2. Along with the counter affidavit, endorsement, dated 08.09.2017, and the proceedings, dated 01.11.2017, are enclosed.

3. According to learned Government Pleader for Revenue, even before the order is passed, on 08.09.2017 an endorsement was made rejecting the request of the petitioner. However, taking due note of the directions issued by this Court, fresh orders were passed on 01.11.2017 rejecting the request of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner sought to contend that the reason assigned for rejection is same as assigned in the order impugned. However, on a careful reading of the order dated 01.11.2017, it is clear that the authority has considered the claim for conversion and noticed certain discrepancies in the documents. Though, the operative portion of the order reflect the reason for rejection to impending acquisition notification, in the earlier part of the order there is detailed discussion. Furthermore, by the time said order was passed, requisition was also made by the Executive

Engineer, Roads & Buildings, National Highway 165, for acquiring the lands.

5. Having regard to the same, it cannot be said that there is disobedience of the direction of this Court.

6. The Contempt case is accordingly closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

5<sup>th</sup> January, 2018  
Rds

**P.NAVEEN RAO,J**

