APHC010109942023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3579]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

CONTEMPT CASE No: 2047 of 2023

VAJRALA RAJINI KUMARI .....Petitioner

Vs.

M.Udaya Bhaskar Rao .....Respondent

****

CORAM: THE CHIEF JUSTICE LISA GILL

SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

DATE : 30th October, 2026

Present:

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr.M.R.K.Chakravathy

Advocate for Respondent : Mr.J.Dileep Kumar

NINALA JAYASURYA, J.

The petitioner / appellant in Writ Appeal No.205 of 2022, filed the present Contempt Case, alleging violation of order dated 08.07.2022 passed in the said appeal. An observation that before considering the appellant / writ petitioner's Mee-Seva application on merits, the respondent No.2 / Tahsildar shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the appellant / writ petitioner was made while disposing of the appeal.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard learned counsel for the respondent.

3. Drawing the attention of this Court to the order dated 10.11.2022 of the respondent herein, learned counsel for the petitioner sought to impress upon this Court that without affording proper opportunity of hearing much less by conducting an enquiry as contemplated under the provisions of the A.P.Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971, order dated 10.11.2022 has been passed, contrary to the letter and spirit of the order dated 08.07.2022. He contended that instead of considering the application of the petitioner on merits, the respondent passed order dated 10.11.2022 referring to a statement prepared by taking the signatures of petitioner on some papers and contents of the same were also not disclosed. He submitted that the petitioner is not educated and not well versed with English Language, that copy of Endorsement dated 01.03.2022 referred to in the Order dated 10.11.2022 which is in English language was furnished to the petitioner on 10.11.2022. Be that as it may. Learned counsel submitted that previously a pass book / title deed was issued in respect of the application scheduled land and only to deprive the petitioner of the valuable land, cause loss and harass her for extraneous reasons, the respondent issued order dated 10.11.2022, in deliberate violation of the Court orders.

4. Considered the submissions made and perused the order dated 10.11.2022.

5. Admittedly, in terms of the observation in the order dated 08.07.2022, an opportunity was afforded to the petitioner and thereafter, respondent

passed order dated 10.11.2022 referring to the Statement dated 10.11.2022, the vernacular version of which is filed along with the reply-affidavit. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner has raised a contention that the same was recorded on some signed papers stated to have been obtained from the petitioner and the contents of the same were also not disclosed, we are afraid that the same cannot be examined in a Contempt Case, where the scope is very limited. Fact remains that the petitioner was afforded a hearing. Correctness of the order with reference to alleged statement purportedly recorded by the respondent has to be adjudicated, if the same is questioned. Further, the submission that petitioner's application was rejected is factually not correct. From a reading of the order dated 10.11.2022 it is clear that while referring to an admission stated to have been made during the course of personal hearing, the petitioner was informed that necessary further action will be taken after receipt of her application in due course.

5. In the aforementioned circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that no case is made out for proceeding against the respondent under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act.

6. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks liberty to challenge the proceedings / order dated 10.11.2022 of the respondent. Recording the said submission and in the light of the view expressed by this Court recorded supra, the Contempt Case is dismissed with a liberty to the

petitioner to work out remedies against the proceedings dated 10.11.2022, in accordance with law. No costs.

Consequently, miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

LISA GILL, CJ **NINALA JAYASURYA, J**

BLV

Whether the order is Speaking / Reasoned : Yes / No
Whether the order is Reportable : Yes / No

THE CHIEF JUSTICE LISA GILL

&

SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

CONTEMPT CASE No: 2047 of 2023

Dt.30.10.2026

BLV