IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

FRIDAY, THE THIRTIETH DAY OF OCTOBER TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K.LAKSHMAN

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 1632 OF 2025

Contempt Case under Section 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 to punish the Respondent herein for the wilful disobedience of order of this Court dated 03/07/2024 passed in W.P.No.17084 of 2024.

Between:

Jangam Radha, W/o Tirupathi, Age 38 years, Occ. Agriculture, R/o Bommakal Village, Karimnagar Mandal, Karimnagar District.

...Petitioner /Writ Petitioner

AND

Sri. L. Prabhakar, Assistant Director of Survey and Land Records, Karimnagar District.

... Respondent /Respondent No.3 in WP.No.17084 of 2020

Counsel for the Petitioner : Sri. Ch Ravi Kumar

Counsel for the Respondent : GP for Revenue

The Court made the following: ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. LAKSHMAN

CONTEMPT CASE No.1632 OF 2025

(CNR.No: : HBHC010369582025)

DATE: 30.10.2026

Between:

Jangam Radha ..Petitioner

AND

Sri L.Prabhakar,
Assistant Director, Survey and Land Records,
Karimnagar District at Karimnagar ..Respondent

This Court made the following:

ORDER:

This Contempt Case is filed alleging wilful and deliberate violation of the order dated 03.07.2024 in W.P.No.17084 of 2024.

2. *Vide* aforesaid order, this Court disposed of the aforesaid writ petition directing respondent No.7 therein-Assistant Director of Survey and Land Records, Karimnagar to consider the F-line application submitted by the petitioner seeking sub-division survey of petitioner's land in terms of the Circulars referred in the order dated 23.08.2022 in W.P.No.32785 of 2022. This Court directed the 7th respondent therein

i.e., the respondent herein to complete the said exercise within a period of two (02) months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. According to the petitioner, the respondent herein did not comply with the said order and therefore, there is wilful and deliberate violation of the said order.

3. Whereas, respondent filed counter affidavit contending that though the petitioner is claiming that she is the absolute owner and possessor of the land admeasuring Ac.2-00 gts in three different by numbers of Sy.No.59 situated at Edulagattepally (V), Manakonduru (M), Karimnagar District, she is the owner of the land only to an extent of Ac.1.22 gts in Sy.No.59/part. The neighbours of the said land objected for conducting of said survey. Therefore, they were not in a position to conduct survey initially. Thereafter, they have issued notices, conducted survey and issued location sketch map on 05.09.2026 to the petitioner herein. Therefore, there is no violation, much less, wilful and deliberate violation of the said order.

4. As discussed supra, the petitioner is claiming that she is the absolute owner and possessor of the land admeasuring Ac.0.14 gts in

Sy.No.59/U/2, Ac.1.07 gts in Sy,No.59/U/1 and Ac.0.19 gts in Sy.No.59/E/1 situated at Edulagattepally (V), Manakonduru (M), Karimnagar District. In proof of the same, she has filed copy of the latest Passbook dated 25.06.2020. According to the petitioner, she has purchased the said land in the year 2019 under a registered sale deed. Therefore, she is cultivating the said land and eking out her livelihood.

5. The neighbouring land owners were trying to encroach upon the land of the petitioner. Therefore, she has submitted an F-line application dated 29.06.2023 to the respondent with a request to conduct sub-division survey and demarcate the subject land by fixing the boundaries. But the same was not considered by the respondent. Therefore, she has filed the aforesaid Writ Petition against the respondents therein in not conducting sub-division survey and demarcating the subject land by fixing the boundaries in terms of the guidelines issued by the respondents from time to time for the purpose of conducting sub-division survey. On consideration of the said aspects, more particularly, latest Passbook issued by the respondents, on coming to a conclusion that the petitioner is the absolute owner and

possessor of the land admeasuring Ac.2-00 gts, vide order dated 03.07.2024, this Court disposed of W.P.No.17084 of 2024 directing the Assistant Director of Survey and Land Records, Karimnagar District i.e., the respondent herein to consider the aforesaid F-line application submitted by the petitioner vide application No.DER022200828082 within two (02) months. This Court also directed the respondent to consider the guidelines issued by the revenue officials from time to time and Circulars referred in the order dated 23.08.2022 in W.P.No.32785 of 2022, while disposing of the F-line application submitted by the petitioner.

6. Perusal of the record would reveal that Mandal Surveyor, Manakondur Mandal had issued notices dated 23.09.2024 scheduling the survey on 26.09.2024. However, he has not conducted sub-division survey on the said date. The petitioner has submitted a representation on 24.10.2024 to the Assistant Director of Survey and Land Records with a request to comply with the order in W.P.No.17084 of 2024. Even then, respondent herein did not comply

with said order. Therefore, the petitioner has filed the present Contempt Case.

7. Respondents have filed counter affidavit on 28.01.2026, two additional counter affidavits on 16.07.2026 and 09.09.2026 vide USR.Nos.83305 & 112790 respectively.

8. In the additional counter affidavit filed on 09.09.2026 respondent filed notice dated 27.08.2026 issued by him scheduling the survey on 05.09.2026, on which date the respondent herein along with Mandal Surveyor and other officials went to the site for the purpose of conducting sub-division survey, but could not conduct the same, as the adjacent land owners submitted a representation dated 05.09.2026 requesting the respondent to put them on notice and afford them an opportunity before conducting sub-division survey. They have specifically stated that there is every possibility of their rights being affected, if they are not put on notice and afforded an opportunity, before conducting sub-division survey and demarcating the subject land by fixing boundaries in respect of Sy.No.59. Therefore, the

respondent has put them on notice and afforded them an opportunity in terms of the order dated 31.07.2026 in Contempt Case.

9. Referring to the Circular dated 13.07.2007 issued by the Commissioner of Survey, Settlements and Land Records, A.P., Hyderabad vide Rc.No.N1/1408/07, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue would contend that sub-division survey will be conducted subject to the actual possession on ground tallying with the documents in the said circular provided that the Transferees name finds place in the Revenue record through proper mutation. According to the respondent, the petitioner is in possession of Ac.1-22 gts in Sy.No.59/part only. However, in paragraph 4 of the additional counter affidavit filed vide USR.No.112790 dated 09.09.2026, the respondent has stated that total extent of land in Sy.No.59 of Edulagattepally (V), Mandakonduru (M) is covered with paddy crop. Petitioner is in possession of land to an extent of Ac.1-22 gts in Sy.No.59/part. The total extent of the land in Sy.No.59 is Ac.13.30 gts. Thus, the respondent has not specifically mentioned the details of said Ac.1-22 gts of which the petitioner is in possession.

10. Thus, the aforesaid facts would reveal that there are serious disputes with regard to possession of the petitioner's land. According to the respondent, out of total extent of Ac.13.30 gts in Sy.No.59, the petitioner is in possession of Ac.1-22 gts in Sy.No.59/part only. But he has not stated the specific by numbers of Sy.No.59, in which the petitioner is in possession in paragraph 4 of the additional counter affidavit filed by him on 09.09.2026.

11. As discussed supra, the Tahsildar, Manakonduru (M), Karimnagar District issued latest Passbook dated 25.06.2020 on completion of LRUS i.e, updation survey only wherein it is stated that petitioner is the owner and possessor of land admeasuring Ac.0.14 gts in Sy.No.59/U/2, Ac.1.07 gts in Sy.No.59/U/1 and Ac.0.19 gts in Sy.No.59/E/1. Thus, altogether she is the owner and possessor of land admeasuring Ac.2-00 gts whereas according to the additional counter affidavit filed by the respondent, petitioner is in possession of Ac.1-22 gts in Sy.No.59/part. He has already furnished location sketch map on 05.09.2026. As discussed supra, vide objections dated 05.09.2026, owners of neighbouring land specifically stated that land in survey

number is going to effect in the event of conducting survey pursuant to the order under Contempt. There are houses and the boundary shown by the petitioner cannot be considered. Thus, there are serious disputes with regard to possession of the petitioner over the aforesaid Ac.2-00 gts in different by numbers of Sy.No.59 of Edulapattepally (V), Manakonduru (M), which the respondent cannot decide.

12. Sri Ch.Ravi Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has purchased the land admeasuring Ac.2-00 gts in Sy.No.59 vide registered sale deed in the year 2019; her name was also mutated in the revenue records and E-Passbook was also issued on 25.06.2020. He further contends that neighbouring land owners are trying to encroach upon her land. The petitioner has specifically stated the said fact in paragraph 4 of the affidavit filed in W.P.No.17084 of 2024.

13. The aforesaid aspects would reveal that there are serious disputes with regard to extent of land claimed by the petitioner and possession of the same. Therefore, the respondent cannot decide the said serious disputes. It is the competent jurisdictional Civil Court

which will decide the said issue. Therefore, the petitioner has to approach the competent jurisdictional Civil Court for resolving the said dispute. The petitioner can also file an application under Order XXVI Rule 9 of C.P.C. seeking appointment of Advocate Commissioner for the purpose of conducting survey including sub-division survey and it is for the said Court to consider the same in accordance with law.

14. It is apt to note that to punish contemnor in terms of Section 10 and 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, there should be wilful and deliberate violation of the order. Mere allegation of violation is not sufficient.

15. In the light of the above, this Court is of the opinion that there is no wilful and deliberate violation of order dated 03.07.2024 in W.P.No.17084 of 2024 under Contempt.

16. Accordingly, the Contempt Case is disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to approach the competent jurisdictional Civil Court by filing a civil suit and also seek appointment of Advocate

Commissioner for the purpose of conducting sub-division survey. No costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the Contempt Case, shall stand closed.

SD/- MOHD. ISMAIL,
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. One CC to SRI. CH RAVI KUMAR, Advocate [OPUC]
2. Two CCs to the GP FOR REVENUE, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad (OUT)
3. Two CD Copies

ADK

HIGH COURT

DATED: 30/10/2026

ORDER

CC.No.1632 of 2025



DISPOSING OF THE CONTEMPT CASE

WITHOUT COSTS

6/11/26