Date of reserved for orders: 01.10.2026
Date of pronouncement : 10.10.2026
Date of uploading : 10.10.2026

APHC010381792026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI [3331]
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

SATURDAY, THE 10th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 3087/2026

Between:

1. BEEDA RAVINDRA, BEEDA RAVINDRA S/O RANGA RAO, AGED ABOUT 54 YEARS,R/O ISKAPALLI-524315, ALLUR (M), NELLORE DT.,
2. GUMMADI SAI RAHUL, S/O RAGHU, AGED 29 YEARS,R/O ISKAPALLI-524315 ALLUR (M), NELLORE DT.,

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. MR K VENKATA NAGA PAVAN, VIlth AddI District Judge, Court Complex Gudur-524101, SPSR Nellore Dt.,

...CONTEMNOR

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 Punish the Respondent for wilfully, intentionally and deliberately violated the order Dt.20.07.2026 passed in C.R.P No.1996/2026 vide Contempt of Courts Act 1971 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 dispense with from filing the certified copies of relevant judicial orders enclosed the present C.0 and to pass

IA NO: 2 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 call for all the records pertains to 0.S.No. 09/2026, on the file of the Respondent and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. PILLUTLA SAI AVINASH

Counsel for the Contemnor:

1. N V SUMANTH

The Court made the following:

ORDER

The above contempt case was filed complaining of violation of the order dated 20.07.2026 passed in C.R.P.No.1996 of 2026.

2. The petitioners herein are the Revision Petitioners No.2 and 3 in C.R.P.No.1996 of 2026. The respondent is the Presiding Officer of the VII Additional District Judge, Gudur.

3. One G. Bharath, represented by his GPA holder, filed suit O.S.No.52 of 2019 on the file of the I Additional District Judge, Nellore against the petitioners herein and another, to declare the plaintiff as the absolute owner of the suit schedule property and for consequential permanent injunction.

4. Defendants No. 1 and 2 filed written statement. Thereafter, the suit was transferred to IV Additional District Judge, Nellore. The defendants filed interlocutory applications, and one such application is I.A.No.469 of 2025 under Order XI Rule 14 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (C.P.C.).

5. Later, the suit was transferred to the VII Additional District Judge, Gudur and renumbered as O.S.No.9 of 2026. I.A.Nos.469, 466, 470 and 471 of 2025

were renumbered as I.A.Nos.282, 283, 285 and 286 of 2026. Learned VII Additional District Judge, Gudur, dismissed I.A.No.286 of 2026 on 07.07.2026. Aggrieved by the same, defendants 1 to 3 filed Civil Revision Petition No.1996 of 2026 (hereinafter referred to as the 'revision').

6. The revision was listed before the Court under the caption 'For Admission' on 20.07.2026. The revision was taken up for hearing at around 11:40 a.m., and an interim order was passed granting stay of all further proceedings in O.S.No.9 of 2026, at 11:45 a.m. In fact, when the revision was taken up for hearing, Smt. Y.L.Siva Kalpana Reddy, learned counsel, submitted that she filed vakalat for respondent No.1/plaintiff *vide* USR No.77167 of 2026. During the course of arguments, learned Senior Counsel Sri V.S.R. Anjaneyulu, assisted by Sri Pillutla Sai Avinash, learned counsel for the petitioners, submitted that the trial Court may pronounce the judgment since the suit was posted for judgment. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 submitted that judgment was pronounced by the trial Court during the call work. In those facts and circumstances of the case, this Court passed an order, the operative portion of which reads as follows:

> "Given the facts and circumstances of the case, there shall be stay of all further proceedings in O.S.No.9 of 2026 on the file of the learned VII Additional District Judge, Gudur, for two (02) weeks, if the trial Court has not delivered the judgment by this time."

7. On 23.07.2026, learned Senior Counsel submitted that the trial Court pronounced the judgment on 20.07.2026.

8. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 reiterated that the interim order in the revision was passed at 11:45 a.m., by which time the trial Court had already pronounced the judgment at 11:00 a.m. during the call work.

9. Learned Senior Counsel for the revision petitioners took time to file a proper affidavit in the revision. Thereafter, the revision was adjourned to

06.08.2026. However, there was no representation for the revision petitioners, and the revision was adjourned to 20.08.2026. Thereafter, the revision was heard on 22.09.2026 and adjourned at the request of learned counsel for the revision petitioners, to get instructions as to whether any petition was filed under Order IX Rule 13 C.P.C. in the suit. Later, the revision was heard on 29.09.2026 and reserved for orders.

10. The above contempt case was filed on 22.07.2026. The Registry returned the same with objections, and the objections were complied with. Thereafter, the contempt case was listed before this Court and notice was ordered on 03.09.2026.

11. Heard Sri V.S.R. Anjaneyulu, learned Senior Counsel, assisted by Sri Pillutla Sai Avinash, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri Gunasekhar, learned counsel representing Sri N.V. Suman, learned counsel for the respondent.

12. Learned Senior Counsel would submit that despite the order of stay granted on 20.07.2026 in O.S.No.9 of 2026 on the file of the learned VII Additional District Judge, Gudur, at 11:45 a.m., the respondent proceeded and pronounced the judgment and thus violated the order. He would further submit that a memo in the trial Court was filed at about 11:58 a.m. Having received the memo intimating the stay granted by this Court, the respondent deliberately pronounced the judgment, as if the judgment was pronounced prior to receiving the memo. Thereby, the respondent violated the order passed by this Court, and hence, is liable to be punished under Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 (for short '**the Act'**). Learned Senior Counsel would further contend that the respondent acted hastily and disposed of the suit, which is of the year 2026. In fact, the judgment was not pronounced in open court.

13. Learned counsel for the respondent, on the other hand, would submit the respondent acted in accordance with law and pronounced the judgment at 11:00 a.m. on 20.07.2026. Since the judgment was pronounced, the learned counsel representing the plaintiff in the suit informed the Court about the pronouncement of the judgment, and hence, the Court passed an order granting stay of all further proceedings in O.S.No.9 of 2026, if the judgment was not pronounced by that time. The respondent did not violate the order of the Court. Thus, prays to dismiss the contempt case.

14. Thus, as seen from the material filed along with the contempt case, out of three defendants, two defendants, i.e. defendants 2 and 3, filed the above contempt case. Much comment was made about the disposal of the suit hastily. However, while dealing with the case of this nature, this Court must see whether the respondent violated the order deliberately and intentionally.

15. Let this Court now examine the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act and the precedents. It is beneficial to refer to the relevant provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act. Section 2 (b) of the Act defines civil contempt as,

> "willful disobedience to any judgment, decree, direction, order, writ or other process of a Court or willful breach of an undertaking given to a Court."

Section 12 of the Act deals with, punishment for contempt of court. Section 12(1) prescribes the punishment of six months' simple imprisonment, maximum or with a fine which may extend to two thousand rupees or both. The proviso specifies that the accused may be discharged, or the punishment awarded may be remitted on an apology being made to the satisfaction of the court. Explanation clarifies that the apology shall not be rejected on the ground that it is qualified or conditional if the accused makes it *bona fide*.

16. In **Baradakanta Mishra Vs. Bhimsen Dixit**[1], the Hon'ble Apex Court held that contempt of Court signifies a willful disregard or disobedience of the Court by acting in opposition to the authority of Justice and dignity thereof. It further held that it signifies a willful disregard or disobedience of the Court order; it also signifies such conduct as tending to bring the authority and administration of law into disrepute.

17. In the celebrated decision of **Attorney General Vs. Times Newspaper Ltd.**[2], Lord Diplock stated: (All ER p. 71f)

> "There is an element of public policy in punishing civil contempt, since the administration of justice would be undermined if the order of any court of law could be disregarded with impunity;…."

18. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Supreme Court Bar Association Vs. Union of India**[3], briefly explained the nature and purpose for which contempt jurisdiction would be exercised by the Constitutional Courts. It held thus:

> "42. The contempt of court is a special jurisdiction to be exercised sparingly and with caution whenever an act adversely affects the administration of justice or which tends to impede its course or tends to shake public confidence in the judicial institutions. This jurisdiction may also be exercised when the act complained of adversely affects the majesty of law or dignity of the courts. The purpose of contempt jurisdiction is to uphold the majesty and dignity of the courts of law. It is an unusual type of jurisdiction combining "the jury, the judge and the hangman" and it is so because the court is not adjudicating upon any claim between litigating parties. This jurisdiction is not exercised to protect the dignity of an individual judge but to protect the administration of justice from being maligned. In the general interest of the community it is imperative that the authority of courts should not be

[1] (1973) 1 SCC 446
[2] (1974) AC 273 : (1973) 3 All ER 54 : (1973) 3 WLR 298 (HL)
[3] (1998) 4 SCC 409

> imperilled and there should be no unjustifiable interference in the administration of justice. It is a matter between the court and the contemnor and third parties cannot intervene. It is exercised in a summary manner in aid of the administration of justice, the majesty of law and the dignity of the courts. No such act can be permitted which may have the tendency to shake the public confidence in the fairness and impartiality of the administration of justice."

19. In **L.D.Jaikwal Vs. State of U.P.**[4], the Hon'ble Apex Court observed as under:

> "20. We are sorry to say we cannot subscribe to the 'slap-say sorry-and forget' school of thought in administration of contempt jurisprudence, Saying 'sorry' does not make the skipper poorer. Saying sorry does not make the person taking the slap smart less upon the said hypocritical word being uttered. Apology shall not be paper apology and expression sorry should come from the heart and not from the pen. For it is one thing to say sorry is another to feel sorry.
>
> 21. The apology tendered by the respondent-contemnor is neither a product of remorse nor is there any evidence of real contrition on his part. It is but a crude and crafty attempt to avoid being committed for contempt. Accepting such an apology, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, would result in the respondent-contemnor going scot free after committing gross contempt of Court."

20. In a recent judgment, the Apex Court in **Sitaram Enterprises Vs. Prithviraj Vardichand Jain**[5], observed that:

> "Disregarding a Court's order may seem bold, but the shadows of its consequences are long and cold."

21. A conspectus of the authorities referred to *supra*, punishing a person for contempt of court is indeed a drastic step, and normally, such an action

[4] (1984) 3 SCC 405
[5] 2024 SCC OnLine SC 2493

should not be resorted to. At the same time, however, it is not only the power but the duty of the court to uphold and maintain the dignity of courts and majesty of law, which may call for such extreme steps. It is for the proper administration of justice and to ensure due compliance with the orders passed by a court, the court should take a strict view under the Act. The Court should not hesitate in exercising the mighty weapon of contempt.

22. This being the legal regime, let this court examine whether the respondent violated the order deliberately and intentionally. This court is conscious that the respondent is a judicial officer and is aware of nuances of legal proceedings.

23. In the case at hand, as narrated supra, on 20.07.2026, when the revision was taken up, learned counsel for respondent No.1 therein informed the Court that the trial Court pronounced the judgment and the same was disputed by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the revision petitioners/defendants. Hence, this Court cautiously used the words 'if not delivered by this time'. Thus, if, by the time the interim order was passed by this Court, the trial court pronounces the judgment, it would not amount to a contumacious act. Though the learned senior counsel argued that the judgment was pronounced after the interim order and in violation of the order, in the facts of this case, this Court is not persuaded by the said submission. The respondent pronounced the judgment even before the interim order was passed by this Court. Of course, this Court is not recording any finding on the merits of the judgment in the suit, in this order.

24. In fact, the learned Senior Counsel submitted that the defendants filed necessary applications before the trial Court to get the judgment set aside, since it is an *ex parte* decree.

25. **In the given case, the judgment passed by a learned trial Court may be reversed by the appellate Court on many grounds. Whether that**

reversal, by itself, would constitute a violation, the answer would be an emphatic 'No'. However, in the case at hand, this Court reiterates that by the time the stay was granted, the trial court had already delivered the judgment and hence, this Court is of the considered opinion that there is no violation of the interim order dated 20.07.2026 in the Civil Revision Petition.

26. This Court does not find any merits in the contempt case, and hence, the Contempt Case is Dismissed. No order as to costs.

As a sequel, all the pending miscellaneous applications shall stand closed.

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

Date: 10.10.2026

IKN