

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

**CONTEMPT CASE No.1558 OF 2018**

**DATED : 31.01.2020**

Between :

Meer Abu Sayeed Khan S/o.Late Mir Abid Ali Khan,  
Age : 26 yrs, OCCu : Private Service,  
R/o.H.No.16-2-751, Karan Bagh,  
Saidabad Colony, Hyderabad & others.

.....Petitioners

And

Smt Yogita Rana, W/o.Not known to the petitioners,  
Occu : District Collector, Hyderabad,  
Having office at Chirag Ali Lane,  
Abids Road, Hyderabad,  
R/o.C/o.Hyderabad District Collector Office,  
Chirag Ali Lane, Abids, Hyderabad & others.

.....Respondents



The Court made the following:

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

**CONTEMPT CASE No.1558 OF 2018**

**ORDER:**

This Court in W.P.No.35091 of 2017 by order dated 24.10.2017, while adjourning the matter at the request of learned Government Pleader, directed that if petitioners were in possession as claimed by them and so far no proceedings were issued against them, they should not be dispossessed from the subject property, without following the due process of law. The subject property mentioned in the prayer of writ petition was land admeasuring 3028 Square yards attached to H.No.6-2-751 in Sy.No.297 Part, Gaddiannaram Village, Saidabad, Hyderabad.

2. This contempt case is filed alleging that there is an attempt to dispossess the petitioners. On a particular day some officials have visited the premises of petitioners to dispossess them and the same would amount to violating the orders of this Court.

3. In the Counter affidavit filed by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, it is stated that the property claimed by petitioners is in Sy.No.297 Part, bearing H.No.6-2-751, whereas Government land is located in Sy.No.38. It is asserted that respondents are not interfering in the possession and enjoyment of the land claimed by the petitioners in Sy.No.297 Part, but they are protecting the land belonging to Government in Sy.No.38. A sketch is also enclosed to the counter affidavit showing that Sy.Nos.297 and 38 are divided by road in T.S.No.4. The photographs are also filed in support of the said stand to show that a road is dividing these two properties and land in Sy.No.38 is an open land. The

officers of Government are trying to protect the land from encroachments and no way interfered with the possession of the property claimed by petitioners in Sy.No.297. The Court is satisfied with the explanation offered.

4. In view thereof, it cannot be said that the respondents have violated the directions of this Court, much less deliberate and willful warranting initiation of contempt proceedings.

5. Contempt case is accordingly, closed. Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

31<sup>st</sup> January, 2020  
Rds

**P.NAVEEN RAO,J**

