

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

**FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY TWO**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 309 OF 2022

(Contempt Case Under Section 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act to punish the Respondents herein for willfully Violating the order disobedience of the Order of the High Court dated 15/12/2020 passed in W.P.No.22656 of 2020 .

Between:

1. Shaik Rafi Ahmed, S/o Shaik Madhar aged about 47 years, Occ- Private Service, R/o Sitarampuram village Mulakalapalli Mandal Bhadradi Kothagudem District
2. Shaik Shafi Ahmed, S/o Shaik Madhar, aged about 45 years Occ- Agriculture R/o Sitarampuram village, Mulakalapalli Mandal, Bhadradi Kothagudem District
3. Shaik Jabi Ahmed, S/o Shaik Madhar, Aged 40 years ,Occ- Private Service R/o Sitarampuram village, Mulakalapalli Mandal , Bhadradi Kothagudem District

...PETITIONERS/WRIT PETITIONERS

AND

1. Shri Sunil Dutt, S/o not known to petitioner Superintendent of Police, Bhadradi Kothagudem
2. Shri.Suresh, S/o not known to petitioners, Station House of officer ,Mulakalapalli PS, Bhadradi Kothagudem

...RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS No. 2& 3

Counsel for the Petitioners :SRI. T SHARATH

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HOME & LAW

The Court made the following: ORDER

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.309 of 2022

ORDER :

Heard Sri T. Sharath, learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Government Pleader for Home, appearing for respondents.

2. This contempt is filed alleging that as per the terms of orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.22656 of 2020, dated 15.12.2022, respondents were required to provide Police protection to petitioners but they have not extended the Police protection, thereby, violating the directions of this Court.

3. Along with the counter affidavit, the deponent enclosed representations submitted on 23.03.2022 and 24.03.2022. It appears that on 23.03.2022, after narrating the alleged instances of threats posed by opponents, petitioners requested to provide Police protection on 24.03.2022 to enable them to fence their land. In compliance of the said request, Police aid was provided to petitioners and with the assistance of Police fencing was erected covering the land in issue. In the representation dated 24.03.2022, petitioners expressed their satisfaction with regard to the manner in which Police provided aid to them.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners sought to contend that threat perception is continuing, there is continuous harassment, intimidation and physical assault by the opponents and so far, 6 complaints were filed on such instances and the respondents herein registered 6 crimes disclosing the unwarranted interference by the opponents but no action is taken so far. He would submit that respondents herein ought to have taken serious note and investigating into the complaints expeditiously.

5. In paragraph No.4 of the reply affidavit filed by petitioners, they state that respondents have only registered complaint on the basis of their representation dated 23.03.2022 but no positive action was taken.

6. The above statement is contrary to what is stated in representation dated 24.03.2022.

7. In terms of the interim order passed by this Court, what is required is whenever a Police protection is sought on a particular day or particular time in a day, the Police are required to provide aid in compliance of the orders of this Court. It appears that on 23.03.2022 a request was made for Police protection on 24.03.2022 and accordingly, the Police aid was provided on 24.03.2022. All other complaints narrate the

incidents which took place earlier. Though those complaints are registered, investigation is still in progress. If there is slackness in investigation or taking firm decisions to prevent the opponents from unnecessarily causing harm to the petitioners, it would be an entirely different exercise and it is for the petitioners to work out the same. It is not the subject of the orders of this Court.

8. In the facts of this case, it cannot be said that there is deliberate or wilful violation by the respondents, warranting initiation of contempt proceedings. Accordingly, the contempt case is closed, leaving it open to the petitioners to work out their remedies on the alleged delay in concluding the investigation and in taking stringent action against the violators of law. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

//TRUE COPY//

SD/-A.V.S.S.C.S.M.SARMA
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. One CC to SRI. T SHARATH Advocate [OPUC]
2. One CCs to GP FOR HOME & LAW , High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OPUC]
3. Two CD Copies
4. One Spare Copy

CDL

BS

HIGH COURT

DATED:24/06/2022

ORDER

CC.No.309 of 2022

CLOSING THE CONTEMPT CASE.



⑤
MA
17/8/22