

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA: HYDERABAD

MAIN CASE: C.C. No.1969 of 2024

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
07.	06.03.2026	<u>CVBR,J</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2026</u> This application is filed by the petitioner, seeking to vacate the order dated 12.02.2026 passed by this Court in I.A.No.1 of 2025 in Contempt Case No.1969 of 2024. 2. The petitioner, appearing as party-in-person, contends that this Court has failed to appreciate the facts regarding the non-compliance of the directions issued by this Court. He submitted that the respondents have continued to mislead the Court and that the dismissal of his previous recall application (I.A.No.1 of 2025) on 12.02.2026 necessitates the intervention by this Court. 3. On the other hand, the learned Government Pleader for Home appearing for the respondents submitted that the petitioner is filing successive applications on the very same set of facts which have already been adjudicated by this Court on merits. He further submitted that the petitioner, under the guise of contempt jurisdiction, is attempting to re-agitate issues that are within the domain of the judicial magistrate where the protest petition is pending.	

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		4. This Court, <i>vide</i> order dated 06.12.2024, closed the Contempt Case after being satisfied that the investigation in Crime No.127 of 2023 was concluded and a final report was filed before the competent Magistrate. Seeking to recall the said order, the petitioner filed I.A.No.1 of 2025, which was dismissed by this Court on 12.02.2026, observing that there was no "willful disobedience" or "error apparent on the face of the record" to warrant a recall. 5. It is well-settled law that the jurisdiction of this Court under the Contempt of Courts Act is summary in nature and the same cannot be invoked to keep the proceedings pending indefinitely, especially once the directions issued by this Court have been substantially complied with. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the manner of investigation or the contents of the final report filed by the police, the appropriate remedy available to him is to agitate such grievances before the concerned Magistrate where the protest petition is pending. The petitioner cannot be permitted to indulge in repetitive litigation by filing successive applications on the same set of facts, which have already been adjudicated by this Court on merits. Such a practice of filing multiple applications and seeking to re-open closed issues not only amounts to an abuse of the process of the Court but also undermines the finality of judicial orders. Since the	

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		earlier recall application (I.A.No.1 of 2025) was already dismissed on merits after hearing both sides at length, this Court finds no grounds to entertain the present application. The present application is devoid of merits and the same is liable to be dismissed. 6. Accordingly, this Interlocutory Application is dismissed. CVBR,J SCS	