APHC010553682026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI [3299]
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE 3rd DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
CONTEMPT CASE NO: 3948/2026

Between:

1. SHAIK FAREED BABA, S/O.LATE SHAIK BUDAN SAHEB,AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS.RESIDENT OF D.NO.1/173, LAKKIREDDIPALLE VILLAGE POST AND MANDAL KADAPA DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. DR SRIDHAR CHERUKURI, I.A.S.,DISTRICT COLLECTOR,YSR KADAPA DISTRICT, KADAPA.
2. KRANTHI KUMAR, TAHSILDAR,MANDAL REVENUE OFFICELAKKIREDDIPALLI, KADAPA DISTRICT.
3. DWARAKANATH REDDY, CORRESPONDENT,SRI SRIVENKATESWARA JUNIOR COLLEGE,LAKKIREDDIPALLI, KADAPA DISTRICT.

...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 summon the Respondents/contemnors herein and punish them for willful, deliberate and intentional contempt of the Order, dt12,08.2014 in W.P.No.23006 pf 2014, passed by this Hon'ble Court

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. N PRAMOD

Counsel for the Contemnor(S):

1.

The Court made the following:

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

Heard Sri N.Pramod, learned counsel for the contempt petitioner.

2. This contempt case has been filed alleging willful disobedience on the part of the respondents/contemnors of the interim order dated 12.08.2014 passed by the erstwhile Composite High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad for the State of Telangana and the State of Andhra Pradesh in W.P.No.23006 of 2014.

3. On 12.08.2014, the Composite High Court passed the following interim order in W.P.No.23006 of 2014:

> *"Notice before admission.*
>
> *Respondents, however, shall not evict the petitioner except after giving notice to the petitioner.*
>
> *List after two (2) weeks in M.L.,"*

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was dispossessed without issuing any notice to him.

5. On a specific query being made to learned counsel for the petitioner, the date of such dispossession could not be stated, as the same is not mentioned in the affidavit. Learned counsel for the petitioner referred to paragraph No.4 of the affidavit, wherein the said issue is stated to have been mentioned. However, even in the said paragraph, the date of such dispossession is not mentioned.

6. In view of the aforesaid, we do not find any merit in the contempt case, based on the averments made without disclosure of the date of dispossession.

7. Accordingly, the contempt case is ***dismissed*** for want of material particulars, however, granting liberty to the petitioner to institute a fresh contempt case by furnishing the necessary particulars, subject to the law of limitation, if so advised.

No order as to costs.

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

RAVI NATH TILHARI, J

Date : 03.11.2026.
RPD.

150

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

(DISMISSED)

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 3948 of 2026

Date:- 03.11.2026

RPD.