APHC010220222026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3624]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE 30th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 2496/2026

Between:

1. JAYANTHI UNNAMATTA, D/O RAMA KRISHNA VUNNAPAMMATTA AGED 30 YEARS, D NO 3-93/2. PEDAPETA, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI DIST, ANDHRA PRADESH. 534235.
2. BONDADA VINOD BABU, S/O SUBBARAO AGED 30 YEARS, 3-28(1), PEDAPETA, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI DIST, ANDHRA PRADESH. 534235.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. S SURESH KUMAR IAS, DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AP SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 522503.
2. DR P SAMPATH KUMAR IAS, COMMISSIONER AND DIRECTOR OF MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, VADDESWARAM, ANDHRA PRADESH.
3. MUKESH KUMAR MEENA IAS, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, AP SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 522503.
4. CHADALAVADA NAGARANI IAS, DISTRICT COLLECTOR, WEST

GODAVARI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

5. SRI KRISHNA MOHAN, AKIVEDU NAGARA MAJOR PANCHAYETI REP BY ITS COMMISSIONER AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI DIST, ANDHRA PRADESH.

6. SK AHMAD FAROOQ, TAHSILDAR, AKIVIDU MANDAL, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH

7. JAMI HYMAVATHI, CHAIRPERSON MUNICIPAL COUNCIL, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH.

8. SRI PUPPALA SATYANARAYANA, S/O NOT KNOWN, AGED 50 YEARS, VICE-CHAIRPERSON, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH.

9. SRI PADALA SRINIVASA REDDY, , S/O NOT KNOWN. COUNSELOR CUM CHIEF WIPP, WARD NO 16, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH.

10. SMT GOPISETTI SATYAVATHI, W/O NOT KNOWN AGED 45 YEARS, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH

11. SMT MOPIDEVI SATYAVATHI, W/O NOT KNOWN AGED 45 YEARS, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH.

12. BATTULA SYAMALA, W/O NOT KNOWN AGED 45 YEARS, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH

13. SMT TIRUMAREDDY MADHAVI, W/O NOT KNOWN AGED 50 YEARS, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH.

14. SMT GURRANA NAGALAKSHMI, W/O NOT KNOWN AGED 40 YEARS, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH

15. KIMIDI ARUNA KUMARI, W/O NOT KNOWN AGED 40 YEARS, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI,

ANDHRA PRADESH.

16. BOLLA VEERA SWETHA, W/O NOT KNOWN AGED 40 YEARS, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH

17. NERELLA PRASANNA, W/O NOT KNOWN AGED 35 YEARS, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH.

18. DIDDI JAGADESH, S/O NOT KNOWN AGED 40 YEARS , AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH.

19. KATTA RAVINDRANATH TAGORE, S/O NOT KNOWN AGED 45 YEARS, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH.

20. GEDELA APPARAO, S/O NOT KNOWN AGED 50 YEARS , AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH

21. KATIKITHALA JOHN WESLY, S/O NOT KNOWN AGED 50 , AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH.

22. GILLA PEDDI RAJU, S/O NOT KNOWN AGED 55 YEARS AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH.

23. MD AFRRON UNNISA, W/O NOT KNOWN AGED 35 YEARS,AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH

24. SMT MOTUPALLI KUMAR, W/O NOT KNOWN AGED 40 YEARS, AKIVEDU NAGARA PANCHAYETI, AKIVEDU, WEST GODAVARI, ANDHRA PRADESH

...CONTEMNOR(S):

Petition under Sections 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act 1971 praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit file herein the High Court may be pleased to pleased to punish the Respondents by invoking the provisions of Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, by taking

appropriate action in accordance with law for their wilful, wanton, and deliberate disobedience of the binding judgment and directions of this Hon'ble Apex court ,in a Special Leave petition SLP (CIVIL) 8519 of 2006 dated 31.01.2018 and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to grant leave to add the respondent Nos. 7 to 24 as party respondents as they are the members of the Akiveedu Municipal Council and thereby passed the Agenda in favour of the construction of the temple disobeying the binding judgment and directions of this Hon'ble Apex Court in a Special Leave petition SLP (CIVIL) 8519 of 2006 dated 31-01-2018 by invoking the provisions of Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, by taking appropriate action in accordance with law for their wilful, wanton, and deliberate in the interest of justice, and to pass.

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. JADA SRAVAN KUMAR

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1.

The Court made the following:

ORDER: :-*(per Hon'ble Sri Justice Ravi Nath Tilhari)*

Heard Sri Jada Sravan Kumar, learned counsel for the contempt petitioners and perused the material on record.

2. The present C.C.No.2496 of 2026 has been filed alleging willful disobedience by the respondents 1 to 24 of the order dated 31.01.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).8519 of 2006. The said order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court reads as under:

> *"….*
>
> *Repeated orders have been passed by this Court with respect to the removal of illegal religious structures which have come up by way of encroachments on public land. Now these matters are pending.*
>
> *Vide orders dated 7.12.2009, the following directions have been issued:*
>
> *"This Court on 29th September, 2009, after taking into consideration the letter dated 19th September, 2009, sent by the Union Home Secretary to the learned Solicitor General of India, we passed the following order:*
>
> > *"We have heard the learned counsel for the parties. Looking to the far-reaching implications and consequences of the orders of this Court, on the oral request of the learned Solicitor General of India, we deem it appropriate to implead all the States and the Union Territories as respondents to this petition. The Registry is directed to issue notices to all the States and the Union Territories within three days. The Union of India is directed to supply the entire set of papers to all the Standing Counsel appearing for the State Governments and the Union Territories.*
> >
> > *The States and the Union Territories may file replies within four weeks and the Union of India is granted liberty to file rejoinder within two weeks thereafter.*
> >
> > *As an interim measure, we direct that henceforth no unauthorized construction shall be carried out or permitted in the name of Temple, Church, Mosque or*

Gurudwara etc. on public streets, public parks or other public places etc.

In respect of the unauthorized construction of religious nature which has already taken place, the State Governments and the Union Territories shall review the same on case to case basis and take appropriate steps as expeditiously as possible.

In order to ensure compliance of our directions, we direct all the District Collectors and Magistrates/Deputy Commissioners in charge of the Districts to ensure that there is total compliance of the order passed by us. They are directed to submit a report within four weeks to the concerned Chief Secretaries or the Administrators of the Union Territories who in turn will send a report to this Court within eight weeks from today.

List this matter for further directions on 7th December, 2009."

All the States and the Union Territories have been served. Despite service, most of the States and Union Territories have not filed affidavits as directed by this Court. In the interest of justice, we grant one more opportunity to the Chief Secretaries/Administrators of the respective States and Union Territories to file affidavits. Let the same be filed within six weeks, failing which the concerned Chief Secretaries and Administrators shall remain present in Court on the next date of hearing.

In case the Chief Secretaries and the Administrators have not issued circulars to all the Collectors and the District Magistrates of the Districts, it shall be issued within two weeks from today.

The Chief Secretaries, in consultation with the respective Governments are directed to frame the policy in respect of existing unauthorised construction of religious nature, which had already taken place. This Court directed the respondents to review the same on case to case basis. Let the policies be formulated by all the States and the Union Territories within four weeks from today.

We are reiterating that the Chief Secretaries, the concerned District Magistrates and the Collectors/Deputy Commissioners in-charge of the Districts must ensure total compliance of our order. Any breach in this respect shall be viewed seriously by this Court.

We direct the Chief Secretaries/Administrators of all the States and Union Territories to circulate copies of the order dated 29th September, 2009 and this order to all

the District Magistrates and Collectors/Deputy Commissioners, other public bodies and local bodies.

We direct the learned Standing counsel appearing for various States and the Union Territories to ensure that all copies of the affidavits are filed in this Court on or before 27th January, 2010 with an advance copy to the learned Solicitor General of India, who is requested to get all these affidavits tabulated and submit a report to this Court on or before 2nd February, 2010.

Place this petition for further directions on 4th February, 2010. Looking to the gravity of this matter, we direct that no order or direction inconsistent to our orders, shall be passed by any other Court in the country."

Vide order dated 16.2.2010, the following directions have been issued:

In pursuance of the order of this Court dated 29th September, 2009, by which this Court directed that henceforth no unauthorized construction shall be carried out or permitted in the name of Temple, Church, Mosque or Gurudwara etc. on public streets, public parks or other public places, the affidavits of all the States and the Union Territories, except the State of Uttarakhand, have been filed. All the States and the Union Territories have taken necessary steps to ensure that no further unauthorized construction shall take place and Court's directions are seriously and meticulously complied with.

The other part of the directions issued on 29th September, 2009, were that in respect of unauthorized construction of religious nature which has already taken place on public streets, public parks or other public places, the State Governments and the Union Territories were directed to review the same on case to case basis and take appropriate steps as expeditiously as possible. We do not find comprehensive and satisfactory affidavits as far as this direction of the order is concerned. Therefore, it has become imperative to direct all the States and the Union Territories to formulate comprehensive policy regarding the removal/ relocation/ regularisation of the unauthorized construction within six weeks' from today. The policy should clearly indicate within what period the States and the Union Territories are going to fully comply with its policy to remove/relocate/regularise the unauthorized construction.

We also direct all the States and the Union Territories to identify unauthorized construction of religious nature on public streets, public parks and public places within six weeks' from today.

We direct the Chief Secretary of the State of Uttarakhand to file an affidavit within two weeks from today. In case the affidavit is not filed, the Chief Secretary shall remain present in Court on the next date of hearing.

We also direct all the Chief Secretaries of the States and the Administrators of the Union Territories to file further comprehensive affidavits within six weeks' from today.

The special leave petition is adjourned to 6th April, 2010."

To ensure the implementation of directions issued by this Court, consensus has been arrived at Bar and in our opinion, rightly, that the implementation of the order should be supervised by the concerned High Courts. We, consequently, remit the above matters to the respective High Courts for ensuring implementation of the orders in effective manner.

The concerned records be transmitted to the respective High Courts. The interim orders wherever passed, shall continue, until the matters are considered by the High Court. In case any clarification is required, it would be open to the parties to approach this Court. The High Court will have the jurisdiction to proceed in the Contempt of any of the orders passed by this Court.

……"

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners refers to the interim measure as was granted in the SLP on 07.12.2009 and reproduced in the order dated 31.01.2018. He submits that as an interim measure, it was directed by the Apex Court that no unauthorized construction shall be carried out or permitted in the name of Temple, Church, Mosque or Gurudwara etc., on public streets, public parks or other public places etc. He further submits that direction was issued to the Chief Secretaries/Administrators of all the States and Union Territories to circulate copies of the order dated 29.09.2009 and the order dated 07.12.2009 to all the District Magistrates and the

Collectors/Deputy Commissioners, other public bodies and local bodies. He further submits that to ensure the implementation of the directions issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court, further direction was issued that the implementation of the order should be supervised by the concerned High Courts, and it was also provided that the High Courts have jurisdiction to proceed in the contempt of any of the orders passed by the Apex Court in the aforesaid SLP.

4. Sri Jada Sravan Kumar, learned counsel for the contempt petitioners submits that the temple is being constructed on the subject land as mentioned in the contempt petition in para No.4 i.e. over the land admeasuring Ac.0.04 cents in Sy.No.470/12 situated at Akiveedu Md of Akivedu Village of West Godavari. He submits that it is a Government land.

5. Learned counsel further submits that there was a proposal dated 18.04.2026 as per the agenda and the resolution was passed in the meeting of Akiveedu Urban Panchayat held on 21.04.2026 with respect to the subject land. The relevant part of the resolution reads as under:

> *"……*
>
> *On examining the said application, the Tahsildar, Akiveedu Mandal informed that the present Ram temple is in a state of ruin within the limits of Pedapeta, Akividu village. And for the purpose of obtaining the Fair Land Register (FLR), the 0.04 cents of the land in Survey No.470-12 has been classified as 'Government Poramboke Temple' and the word Ramalayam is written on the wall of the said temple. And it has been informed that the same has been registered in the present Webland/Adangal."*

6. Learned counsel further submits that the permission was granted by the District Collector on 23.04.2026 and the Commissioner also granted permission on 24.04.2026 for construction of the temple.

7. From the aforesaid, it is evident that on the subject land, there was a Ram temple existing which became dilapidated. The submission that the land is the Government land is also not supported by but is contrary to the revenue record entry. Learned counsel referred to the copy of the Adangal report to contend that the land is the Government land, but a perusal thereof, also shows that in column number 6 under the caption nature of the land, 'temple' is mentioned. In view thereof, it is not an undisputed case of the subject land being the Government land rather *prima facie* the documents annexed to the petition and the material on record show the existence of temple, and the nature of the land as temple land. There was Ram temple already existing in the state of ruin and for its reconstruction, the permission was granted by the administrative authorities.

8. The 1st petitioner had filed W.P.(PIL)No.95 of 2026 *inter alia* on the same subject on the allegation that the land in question which had been used by the villagers partly as a public utility place known as "Racha Banda" and there existed Sri Gonthenamma temple of the gram devatha. It was contended in the W.P. (PIL) that the land was the Government land. The submission with respect to the order of the Hon'ble Apex Court in SLP (CIVIL) 8519 of 2006 and batch, was also raised. On consideration of the

submissions advanced, W.P.(PIL) was disposed of with liberty to the present 1st petitioner, to file appropriate application, in another then pending W.P.No.9991 of 2026, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the matter.

9. The order dated 29.04.2026 passed in W.P.(PIL) No.95 of 2026 is reproduced as under:

> *"This writ petition has been filed in public interest by petitioner, who claims to be a resident of Akivedu village.*
>
> *2. It is submitted that land in question has been used by villagers partly as a public utility place known as "Racha Banda" and there exists Sri Gonthenamma temple of the gram devatha.*
>
> *3. It is contended that land in question is Government land and existing building has been demolished after filing of this writ petition and an attempt is being made to construct a Ramalayam without taking any permission from Government authorities.*
>
> *4. It is further contended that in terms of judgment dated 31.01.2018, of Hon"ble the Supreme Court in Union of India Vs. State of Gujarat & Others [SLP (C).No.8519 of 2006 and batch of other petitions] there can be no construction of any religious structures by encroachment upon Government land; therefore, action being taken by respondent No.6 in connivance with official respondents is illegal and arbitrary.*
>
> *5. Learned counsel for respondent No.6, at this stage, points out that WP.No.9991 of 2026 has been filed by another resident of Akivedu village claiming that inaction of official respondents in preventing private respondent from construction of a religious building on Government land which is being used as Racha Banda – public utility place, without prior permission from competent authority is illegal and arbitrary.*
>
> *6. It is further submitted by learned counsel for respondent No.6 that land in question was allotted for purpose of temple in the year 1932 and revenue records reflect the same; moreover, construction is being carried out after obtaining due permission from authorities.*
>
> *7. In WP.No.9991 of 2026, notice was issued on 15.04.2026. Relevant portion of said order reads as under:*
>
> > *"Learned counsel for the Writ Petitioners would contend that in the Survey No.470-12 at SC Malapeta, Akiveedu villae of West Godavari District, there exists an old dilapidated structure, which is being used as Rachha Band, a*

common meeting place of villagers. But, the unofficial respondents claim that it is an old dilapidated temple of Lord Sri Rama and attempting to convert the said public place into a permanent religious structure in the name of Ramalayam.

Learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.4 submits that without there being any permission from the respective Officials, no untoward action will be taken as alleged by the Writ Petitioners.

Recording the same, list the mater after Three (03) weeks."

8. On a pointed query, learned counsel for petitioner fairly states that petitioner in WP.No.9991 of 2026 is indeed identically situated as the present petitioner and that prayer as addressed is also similar while vehemently arguing that as there is violation of specific directions issued by the Hon"ble Supreme Court, therefore, present writ petition has been filed in public interest as well. The same should thus be entertained and appropriate orders passed. Furthermore, after filing of this writ petition, demolition of structure in question has been carried out. This also is sufficient cause for entertaining this petition.

9. We have heard learned counsel for parties and have carefully perused the file.

10. It is a matter of record that WP.No.9991 of 2026 has been filed by an identically situated resident of Akivedu village as petitioner herein, raising similar grounds.

11. Notice has already been issued in WP.No.9991 of 2026 and the matter is pending adjudication. All pleas as are being raised before us in this writ petition, it is conceded, have been raised in earlier writ petition. In any case, it is always open to the present petitioner to file appropriate application for being impleaded in WP.No.9991 of 2026 and all available pleas can be raised in pending matter. It is also open to petitioner in WP.No.9991 of 2026 to file appropriate application for advancement of proceedings in case of any emergent situation as is sought to be projected before us. In the given factual circumstances, we do not find any reason to cause interference in present proceedings.

12. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances as above, this Writ Petition (PIL) is disposed of with liberty to petitioner to file appropriate application before learned single Bench in pending proceedings. There is no expression of opinion on merits of the matter lest there be prejudice to any of the parties. No costs."

10. As submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners in W.P.No.9991 of 2026 filed by a third party, initially, notice was issued on 15.04.2026. It was pending at the time of disposal of W.P.(PIL) No.95 of

2026. Later on, W.P.No.9991 of 2026 was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file fresh petition in accordance with law, by order dated 30.04.2026. He submits that the writ petition was filed at a time when the permission had not been granted. But subsequently, during the pendency of the writ petition, the permission was granted by the Collector on 23.04.2026 and also by the Commissioner on 25.04.2026 and in view thereof, W.P.No.9991 of 2026 was got dismissed as withdrawn.

11. The order dated 30.04.2026 passed in W.P.No.9991 of 2026 is being reproduced as under:

> *"The present writ petition is filed against the action of the respondents in not preventing the unofficial respondents from constructing a religious building in the government land situated at Sy.No.470-12 at SC Mala Peta, Akividu village, Akiveedu West Godavari district, which is being used as Racha Banda/public utility place, without prior permission from the competent authority.*
>
> *2. Heard Sri Jada Sravan Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri Y.V.Ravi Prasad, learned Senior counsel appearing for 6th respondent.*
>
> *3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in elaboration to what has been stated in the affidavit contended that, without there being any permission as required under Section 202, 203 & 209 of A.P.Municipalities Act, 1965 & Rule 26 of the A.P.Gram Panchayat Land Development (Layout and Building) Rules, 2002, the un-official respondents are proceeding with the construction of temple that too, in the land classified as Government Land and fixed 'Bhoomi Pooja' on 03.05.2026. He further submitted that, if such a construction is proceeded further, it not only amounts to miscarriage of justice but the rights of the villagers who are using the subject land as Rachabanda will be affected. In support of his contentions, he relied on the judgment of the Apex court in Union of India & anr Vs State of Gujarat & ors((2011) 14 SCC 62) and prayed to pass appropriate orders in that regard.*
>
> *4. On the other hand, Sri Y.V.Ravi Prasad, learned Senior counsel appearing for 6th respondent while relying on the material filed along with memo submitted that, the petitioners without even verifying with the authorities filed this writ petition, as if the unofficial respondents are proceeding with the construction without plan and moved the same by way of lunch motion. He further submitted that, in fact, the authorities, after verifying the entire material on record and duly taking note of the*

enquiry report, have found that the said temple is in existence since time immemorial, and now there is requisite permission to re-construct temple in that place and in view of the same, the petitioners cannot contend that the said temple is being constructed without plan. He further submitted that, in fact the land is classified as temple land as per the revenue records, as such, the petitioners cannot say that it is a Government land.

5. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioners sought permission of this court to withdraw the Writ Petition with a liberty to file fresh writ petition questioning the said plan.

6. Recording the same, the Writ Petition is dismissed as withdrawn with a liberty to file fresh writ petition in accordance with law. No costs."

12. As submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners challenging the order dated 29.04.2026 passed in W.P.(PIL) No.95 of 2026, SLP to Appeal (C) No.16996 of 2026 was filed, but the same was also dismissed by the Hon'ble Apex Court vide order dated 27.07.2026, which order is reproduced as under:

"We are not inclined to interfere with the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court. The Special Leave Petition is, accordingly, dismissed."

13. On consideration of the submissions advanced, the aforesaid orders passed in W.P.No.9991 of 2026, W.P.(PIL) No.95 of 2026 and SLP (CIVIL) 8519 of 2006 and batch, as also the material on record, we are of the view that it is not a case "of undisputed Government land", but the nature of the land recorded is 'temple'. The temple was already existing which became in a ruin condition and the permission has been granted for reconstruction. It could not be shown to us that such permission is under challenge before any forum.

14. We do not find it a case for the issuance of notice to the respondents. In our view, even no *prima facie* case, for contempt of the order of the Hon'ble Apex Court is made out.

15. The Contempt Case is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall also stand closed.

RAVI NATH TILHARI, J

ALAPATI GIRIDHAR, J

Date: 30.10.2026
ARR

200

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 2496/2026

Date: 30.10.2026

ARR