

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

**FRIDAY, THE THIRTIETH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY THREE**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 723 OF 2023

Contempt Case under Sections 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act 1971 to punish the respondents herein for willful disobedience and non-compliance of the Order of the Hon'ble Court dated 16.12.2022 passed in W.P.No.44993 of 2022.

Between:

Paidimalla Shobha Rani, W/o. Anil Kumar, aged 39 years, Occ. Housewife,
H.No. 2-65/1, Mulugu Town, Mulugu Mandal and District.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. Sri. D.Venkaiah, District Panchayat Officer, Mulugu District.

(CC closed against R1 as per court order dt.16.06.2023 in CC 723 of 2023)

2. Sri. S.Mahender, Executive Officer, Mulugu Gram Panchayat, Mulugu District.

...CONTEMNORS

Counsel for the Petitioner : Sri JITHENDER RAO VEERAMALLA

Counsel for Respondent No.1 : GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

Counsel for Respondent No.2 : Sri R. CHANDRA SHEKAR REDDY

The Court made the following: ORDER

HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE LALITHA KANNEGANTI

CONTEMPT CASE No. 723 of 2023

ORDER:

This Court by order dated 16.12.2022 disposed of Writ Petition No. 44993 of 2022 directing the official respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 28.10.2022. It is the case of the petitioner that the unofficial respondents without obtaining any permission are going ahead with the construction. The present Contempt Case is filed stating that the respondents have not acted upon the order passed by this Court.

2. A counter-affidavit is filed stating that permission was granted in favour of the unofficial respondents on 01.09.2020.

3. In response to that, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents are making wrong statement before this Court. It is stated that in respect of the very same issue, when the Mandal Panchayat Officer has submitted a representation to the Additional Collector, Mulugu District dated 24.04.2023, they have not mentioned about the said permission granted in favour of the unofficial respondents. It is stated that only with an intention to get over this contempt, they have come up with such a plea.

4. This Court has directed the respondents to consider the representation and take action on the illegal construction. According to the respondents, that is not the illegal construction and permission was granted. It is the case of the petitioner that proceedings dated 24.04.2023 also do not reflect the said permission, according to them, it is placed before this Court for the purpose of contempt. This Court is not inclined to go into all those issues as it is stated by the respondents that the unofficial respondents obtained permission, as such, there is no violation of the order dated 16.12.2022 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 44993 of 2022. If the petitioner is aggrieved by any of the actions of the respondents, he is at liberty to move an appropriate Application.

5. The Contempt Case is accordingly, dismissed.

6. Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending shall stand closed.

Sd/- CH. VENKATESWARLU
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//



SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. One CC to Sri JITHENDER RAO VEERAMALLA, Advocate [OPUC]
2. One CC to Sri R. CHANDRA SHEKAR REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
3. Two CCs to GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV ,High Court for the State of Telangana. [OUT]
4. **Two CD Copies**

NJB

kam

PMA.

HIGH COURT

DATED:30/06/2023

ORDER

CC.No.723 of 2023



DISMISSING THE CONTEMPT CASE

7 pm.
14/8/23.