IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT: HYDERABAD

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. LAKSHMAN

CONTEMPT CASE No.2900 OF 2025
(CNR No.HBHC010624912025)

Reserved on: 16.10.2026 **Pronounced on: 30-10-2026**
Uploaded on : 30-10-2026

Between:

Mrs. P. Shivaleela & another .. Petitioners

Vs.

Mr. C. Narayana Reddy, I.A.S.,
District Collector, Rangareddy District .. Respondent

This Court delivered the following:

ORDER:

Heard Mr. Vijay B. Paropkari, learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Government Pleader for Revenue appearing for the respondent.

2. This Contempt Case is filed alleging willful and deliberate violation of the order passed by this Court in W.P. No.22093 of 2025, dated 05.08.2025.

3. The petitioners herein had filed the aforesaid writ petition seeking the following relief:

> "It is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction, more

particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ declaring the action of the respondents in not considering the applications dated 14.03.2024 submitted by the petitioners to respondent No.3 for issuance of NOC as illegal, arbitrary, unjust and against the principles of natural justice and consequently direct respondent No.3 to issue NOC in respect of Plot No.59 and Plot No.62 (Eastern Part) in Survey Nos.536, 537, 657 and 658 situated at Manne Muthyalamma Kunta, Turkayamjal Municipality, Ranga Reddy District, in terms of the decision of respondent No.3 vide Lr.B/E4/4345/2021 dated 27.08.2022 and the consequent Memo No.15738/G1/2022 dated 02.09.2022 issued by respondent No.2 by deleting the same from the Prohibitory Properties Register and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice."

4. *Vide* order dated 05.08.2025, this Court disposed of the aforesaid writ petition with the following direction to respondent No.3 therein i.e., the respondent herein:

"In the light of the aforesaid discussion, this writ petition is disposed of directing the 3rd respondent to consider the representation dated 14.03.2024 submitted by the petitioners herein for deletion of the subject Plots i.e., Plot No.62 (Eastern Part) and Plot No.59 in Survey Nos. 536, 537, 657 and 658, situated at Manne Muthyalamma Kunta, Turkayamjal Village and Municipality, Abdullapurmet Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, from List of

Prohibitory Properties **in terms of the proceedings issued by the 3rd respondent vide Lr.B/E4/4345/2021, dated 27.08.2022 and the consequential Memo No.15738/G1/2022, dated 02.09.2022 of the 6th respondent**. If the 3rd respondent is not inclined to accept the request made by the petitioners herein, he shall pass a reasoned order and communicate a copy of the said order to the petitioners herein. He shall complete the aforesaid entire exercise within a period of sixty days (60) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order."

5. In view of the above order, which is under contempt, the respondent was required to consider the application of the petitioners within sixty (60) days from the date of receipt of the copy of the said order. According to the petitioners, they have submitted copy of the aforesaid order to the respondent herein along with covering letter dated 07.09.2025 under the acknowledgment dated 11.08.2025. Therefore, the respondent has to consider the request of the petitioners by 10.10.2025. Despite repeated requests made by the petitioners, the respondent neither considered the representation of the petitioners, nor complied with the order under contempt. Thus, there is willful and deliberate violation of the order under contempt. Therefore, the petitioners have filed the present contempt case on 15.10.2025.

i) It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the respondent has deliberately and willfully violated the order under contempt by not passing any order within the stipulated period of sixty (60) days as directed by this Court. Only after filing the present contempt case and receipt of notice by the respondent in the said contempt case *vide* proceedings No. E4/2716/2026, dated 26.02.2026, the respondent has passed the order rejecting the request made by the petitioners. Referring to the said proceedings, the learned counsel would contend that there is no reference with regard to Lr.B/E4/4345/2021, dated 27.08.2022 of the respondent herein and the consequential Memo No.15738/G1/2022, dated 02.09.2022 of respondent No.6 in the writ petition, and thereby the respondent has violated the order under contempt.

ii) According to the learned counsel, the petitioners sought to delete the subject plots located in Survey Nos.536, 537, 657 and 658 of Turkayamjal Revenue Village, Abdullapurmet Mandal, Rangareddy District. Out of the said Survey numbers, Survey No.537 has been already deleted from the prohibitory properties list under Section 22A (1) (d) of the Registration Act, 1908 (for short 'Act, 1908'), however, the remaining survey numbers i.e., Survey Nos.536, 657 and 658 are

not deleted, and there is no explanation from the respondent as to why and how Survey No.537 was deleted but Survey Nos.536, 657 and 658 were not deleted from the prohibited list under Section - 22A of the Registration Act, 1908.

iii) Learned counsel would submit that one of the subject plots i.e., Plot No.62 consists of 1067 square yards and the said plot was divided into two plots i.e., Plot No.62 (Eastern Part) and Plot No.62 (Western Part), admeasuring 533.5 square yards each. Plot No.62 (Western Part), admeasuring 533.5 square yards was already deleted from the prohibitory list by the then District Collector, *vide* Lr.B/E4/4345/2021, dated 27.08.2022 and the consequential Memo No.15738/G1/2022, dated 02.09.2022 of the District Registrar, Rangareddy District. In fact, the said proceedings were issued in pursuance of the orders passed by this Court in W.P. No.13624 of 2021 and the consequential initiation of contempt proceedings in C.C. No.1586 of 2021. Therefore, to maintain parity, the petitioners herein are also entitled to the said relief.

iv) The learned counsel would also contend that as per the letter No.CC/180111/E/1975, dated 26.02.2010 issued by the Special

Grade Deputy Collector & Revenue Divisional Officer, Rangareddy East Division to the Sub-Registrar, Vanasthalipuram, Rangareddy District, various survey numbers including subject survey numbers were deleted from the ceiling purview. Pursuant to the said letter, the Sub-Registrar, Vanasthalipuram, has been accepting the documents for registration. Based on the said letter, the petitioners have also purchased the subject plots.

v) The learned counsel would further contend that pursuant to the application made by the Layout Association and the writ petitioner in W.P. No.13624 of 2021, a detailed report was submitted by the then Tahsildar, Abdullapurmet Mandal to the RDO, Ibrahimpatnam Division, *vide* Lr.No.C/920/2017, dated 03.06.2017, recommending the Authority to delete Plot Nos.1 to 277, which includes the subject plots. In fact, in the said report, there is no reference with regard to the alleged taking over possession of the subject survey numbers by the RDO and on the other hand, it is mentioned that the members of the Layout Association are in physical possession of the respective plots. If really the RDO had taken possession of the land in Survey Nos.536, 537, 657 and 658, as mentioned in paragraph No.5 of the counter affidavit, a reference could have been made therein for the

relevant years in the 'possessor' column either as 'Ceiling Surplus' or 'Government Land'. There is no such reference either in the report or the counter affidavit. Therefore, the contention of the respondent that unless and until the RDO and the Tahsildar follows the procedure laid down under A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Rules, 1974 (for short 'Rules, 1974), the respondent cannot consider the request of the petitioners is false. Further, the said plea cannot be considered in the contempt proceedings as the scope of contempt is very limited.

vi) The learned counsel also would contend that the initial contention of the learned Government Pleader for Revenue that the subject land is the subject matter of LRA No.8 of 2022 is not helpful for the reason that the said LRA No.8 of 2022 was already rejected by the learned II Additional District Judge, Rangareddy District at L.B. Nagar *vide* order dated 25.04.2026 on the ground that it is barred by limitation. It is further brought to the notice of this Court that while pending LRA No.8 of 2022 itself, some of the plots including neighbouring plot were deleted from prohibitory list. The core contention of learned Government Pleader to the effect that subsequent to the order dated 05.01.2004 passed by the Land Reforms

Tribunal (LRT) under Section - 9 of the A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973 (for short 'Act, 1973'), no orders were passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer (RDO), to deliver the possession of the land, which were deleted from the declarant holding, and in pursuance of the orders of the LRT, dated 05.01.2004, no lands were reverted to the declarant under the cover of *panchanama* in Form - XI-A, and unless the procedure contemplated under Rule - 10A (6), 10A (7) and 10A (8) of the Rules, 1974 is followed by the RDO and the Tahsildar, the respondent cannot invoke to de-notify the subject lands under Section 22-A of the Act, 1908 is false and cannot be considered in this contempt proceeding. The scope of contempt is very limited and the respondent cannot agitate the aforesaid contention in contempt case and if at all he is aggrieved by the order under contempt, he has to challenge the same. Without challenging the order under contempt, the respondent cannot take the said plea in the contempt proceedings. In support of the same, learned counsel placed reliance on the decisions rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme

Court in **Jalim Singh v. Nand Kishore**[1] and **Union of India v. Subedar Devasy PV**[2].

vii) With the aforesaid submissions, learned counsel for the petitioner sought to punish the respondent for contempt in accordance with law.

6. Whereas, the respondent opposed the contempt by filing counter affidavit and two additional counter affidavits.

7. Admitting the ownership and possession of the petitioners in respect of the subject plots, the respondent contended that even though LRA No.8 of 2022 was dismissed by learned II Additional District Judge, Rangareddy District at L.B. Nagar, still there is a procedure to be followed by the RDO and the Tahsildar as per the Rules, 1974, for reverting the land to the declarant.

i) Subsequent to the order dated 05.01.2004 passed by the LRT under Section - 9 of the Act, 1973 in CC/1801/E/1975, no lands were reverted to the declarant under the cover of *panchanama* in Form-XI-A and unless the procedure contemplated under Rule - 10A (6), 10A (7) and 10A (8) of the Rules 1974, was followed by the RDO and the

[1]. 2026 LiveLaw (SC) 364
[2]. (2006) 1 SCC 613

Tahsildar, the respondent cannot de-notify the subject lands under Section 22-A of the Act, 1908.

ii) As far as deletion of neighbouring plot i.e., Plot No.62 (Western Part) is concerned, it is contended that the then District Collector without following the aforesaid procedure deleted the same, which is illegal. Therefore, there is no violation, much less willful and deliberate violation of the order under contempt. Therefore, he sought to dismiss the contempt case filed by the petitioners.

8. This Court heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Revenue extensively and gave thoughtful consideration of the same.

9. In **Jalim Singh**[1] relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioners, the Apex Court categorically held that **while exercising contempt jurisdiction, the Court must confine its inquiry to the compliance of the operative directions contained in the original order. The jurisdiction is limited to examining compliance and does not extend to the re-adjudication of issues that have already attained finality between the parties**.

10. In **Subedarr Devassy PV**[2] relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioners, the Apex Court held as under:

> **"5.** In *Mohd. Iqbal Khanday* v. *Abdul Majid Rather* [(1994) 4 SCC 34] it was held that if a party is aggrieved by the order, he should take prompt steps to invoke appellate proceedings and cannot ignore the order and plead about the difficulties of implementation at the time contempt proceedings are initiated.
>
> **6.** If any party concerned is aggrieved by the order which in its opinion is wrong or **against the rules or its implementation is neither practicable nor feasible**, it should always either approach the court that passed the order or invoke jurisdiction of the appellate court. **Rightness or wrongness of the order cannot be urged in contempt proceedings**. **Right or wrong, the order has to be obeyed. Flouting an order of the court would render the party liable for contempt**. While dealing with an application for contempt, the court cannot traverse beyond the order, non-compliance with which is alleged. In other words, it cannot say what should not have been done or what should have been done. It cannot traverse beyond the order. It cannot test the correctness or otherwise of the order or give additional direction or delete any direction. That would be exercising review jurisdiction while dealing with an application for initiation of contempt proceedings. The same would be impermissible and indefensible."

11. It is apt to note that the scope of contempt is very limited and the Court cannot travel beyond its jurisdiction in such proceedings as held by the Apex Court. At the same time, the Apex Court in a catena of judgments time and again categorically held that to punish a contemnor under Sections - 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, there should be deliberate and willful violation of the order and mere allegation of violation of the order is not sufficient.

12. In **J.S. Parihar v. Ganpat Duggar**[3] and **Snehasis Giri v. Subhasis Mitra**[4], the Apex Court held that Court, in lawful exercise of contempt jurisdiction, cannot examine the merits of a decision.

13. In **Supreme Court Bar Association v. Union of India**[5], the Constitution Bench of the Apex Court held that 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. It is exercised in a summary manner in aid of the

---

3. (1996) 6 SCC 291
4. (2023) 18 SCC 529
5. (1998) 4 SCC 409

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.

14. In **Niaz Mohammad v. State of Haryana**[6], the Apex Court that civil contempt under Section 2(b) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 requires willful and intentional disobedience of a court order. Mere non-compliance is insufficient to warrant punishment. The Court must consider the facts and circumstances of the case, including whether compelling circumstances made compliance impossible. The alleged disobedience must be established beyond reasonable doubt.

15. While reviewing the nature of contempt proceedings, it is important to examine the acts of the alleged contemnor. The Court has clarified that while the beneficiary of a Court order is entitled to its enforcement, the evaluation of whether a contemnor should be punished for non-compliance involves a comprehensive consideration of all relevant facts and circumstances. The Contempt of Courts Act specifies that civil contempt involves willful disobedience of Court order. Consequently, before a contemnor can be penalized, the Court

---

[6]. (1994) 6 SCC 332

must come to a conclusion that there has been disobedience but also that such disobedience was deliberate and intentional. Furthermore, if the Court, upon examining the circumstances of a particular case, concludes that disobedience occurred due to extenuating factors, it retains the discretion to refrain from punishing the alleged contemnor despite acknowledging the anomaly, if any.

16. It is well settled that, in contempt proceedings, the alleged contemnor cannot re-agitate issues which stand concluded in the original proceedings. The jurisdiction of the Court is confined to examining compliance with its binding directions and determining whether there has been willful disobedience thereof. The contempt jurisdiction cannot be converted into an appellate or review jurisdiction over the original judgment.

17. Coming to the case on hand, there is no doubt that the petitioners are the absolute owners and possessors of the subject plots i.e., Plot No.62 (Eastern Side) and Plot No.59, admeasuring 533.5 and 1067 square yards respectively, in Survey Nos.536, 537, 657 and 658, situated at Manne Muthyalamma Kunta, Turkayamjal Revenue Village, Abdullapurmet Mandal, Rangareddy District, and admittedly

they are in possession of the same, on the strength of the registered sale deeds bearing document Nos.9167 of 2016 and 10442 of 2023, dated 16.02.2016 and 17.08.2023, respectively.

18. The only contention raised by the by the learned Government Pleader for Revenue appearing for the respondent in the counter, additional counters, and during the course of hearing is that pursuant to the order dated 05.01.2004 passed by the LRT in CC/1801/E/1975, the subject lands including the lands covered by the subject survey numbers were not reverted back to the declarant under cover of *panchanama* in Form-XI-A, for which procedure was contemplated under Rule - 10A (6), 10A (7) and 10A (8) of the Rules, 1974. Since such procedure is not followed by the RDO and the Tahsildar, the respondent cannot consider the request of the petitioners. Whereas, it is contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the adjacent plot and two other plots were already deleted from prohibitory properties list and, therefore, parity has to be maintained in respect of the subject plots as well. Further, the scope of contempt is very limited, and the aforesaid contention of the respondent cannot be considered in contempt proceedings. If the respondent is aggrieved by the order under contempt and not in a

position to comply, he should have challenged the same. Even the order under contempt was passed by this Court considering the order dated 21.06.2021 passed in W.P. No.13624 of 2021 in respect of the adjacent plot and other plots. The order dated 21.06.2021 in W.P. No.13624 of 2021 in respect of the adjacent plot had attained finality and the adjacent plot and other plots were already deleted from prohibitory properties list. Therefore, without challenging both the orders, the respondent cannot agitate the same in the contempt proceedings.

19. On consideration of the submissions advanced, it is evident that the respondent had knowledge with regard to the order under contempt. However, only after the contempt case was filed, the respondent had issued notices to the petitioners and passed the rejection order dated 26.02.2026. After passing the order, the respondent filed counter on 13.03.2026 contending that the RDO and the Tahsildar did not take any steps for reverting the possession to the declarant pursuant to the order dated 05.01.2004 passed by the LRT. Even in the said counter, the respondent has taken the ground of pendency of LRA No.8 of 2022. The petitioners filed an elaborate reply affidavit dated 16.04.2026 to the counter refuting the

contentions of the respondent. On a perusal of the reply affidavit and the subsequent dismissal of the said LRA No.8 of 2022, this Court once again directed the respondent to reconsider the request of the petitioners. Pursuant thereto, again the respondent issued notice to the petitioners and passed order dated 08.07.2026 rejecting the request of the petitioners. Though there is reference with regard to the Lr.B/E4/4345/2021, dated 27.08.2022 and the consequential Memo No.15738/G1/2022, dated 02.09.2022 in the second rejection order, the explanation given by the respondent therein is against the order under contempt. Thereafter, the respondent filed additional counter along with the copies of order in LRA No.8 of 2022 and the rejection order dated 08.07.2026.

20. Perusal of rejection orders dated 26.02.2026 and 08.07.2026, rejecting the request of the petitioners would disclose that though there is mention with regard to the instructions in the DLSC meeting held on 24.02.2026 and the letter No.B/2950/2024, dated 26.02.2026 of the Tahsildar, Abdullapurmet Mandal, the respondent did not file those documents along with the counter and additional counter for the reasons best known to him.

21. While so, it was brought to the notice of this Court by learned counsel for the petitioners that only one of the subject survey numbers (Survey No.537) was deleted from the prohibitory list maintained under Section 22-A of the Act, 1908 by retaining remaining survey numbers, for which, learned Government Pleader admits that it had occurred mistakenly. This Court directed the respondent to file additional counter to that effect. Accordingly, the respondent filed the additional counter on 19.10.2026. Perusal of the said additional counter affidavit would disclose that there is no whisper with regard to the deletion of Survey No.537 from Section 22-A of the Act, 1908 and keeping remaining Survey Nos.536, 657 and 658. It appears that the additional counter affidavits filed by the respondent are nothing but reiteration of the counter affidavit of the respondent.

22. The sum and substance of the counter and additional counters filed by the respondent is that originally LRT passed orders on 13.10.1977 under Section - 9 of the Act, 1973 determining that the declarant held land to an extent of 8.9898 SH in excess of the ceiling area. Pursuant to the said orders, LRT passed orders under Section - 10 (1) of the Act, 1974, requesting the Tahsildar, to take necessary

action for taking possession of the lands as per the provisions of the Act. Thereafter, the RDO has passed order *vide* No.E/1801/75, dated 08.09.1985, to take possession of the land in excess which is surrendered or deemed to have been surrendered under Section - 11 of the Act, 1974. Even pursuant to the order dated 05.01.2004 of the LRT, no orders were passed by the RDO, to re-deliver the possession of the land, which were deleted from the declarant holding under the cover of *panchanama* in Form-XI-A, and unless the procedure contemplated under Rule - 10A (6), 10A (7) and 10A (8) of the Rules, 1974 is followed by the RDO and the Tahsildar, the respondent cannot de-notify the subject plots/lands under Section 22-A of the Act, 1908. But the respondent did not file any document to show that the RDO has passed order dated 08.09.1985 to take possession of the land in various survey numbers including the subject survey numbers. However, all these pleas/contentions cannot be considered in this contempt case.

23. Perusal of the reply affidavit filed by the petitioners would reveal that pursuant to the order dated 15.02.2001 in C.R.P. No.1577 of 1997 and batch, this Court set aside the order dated 10.10.1996 and remanded L.RA. No.8 of 1996 and batch to the Chairman, Land

Reforms Appellate Tribunal-cum-II Additional District Judge, Rangareddy District at L.B. Nagar, for fresh disposal of the said LRAs, in accordance with law. Pursuant to the said remand, the LRAT allowed L.R.A. Nos.1 of 1996 to 8 of 1996, 13 of 1996 to 20 of 1996 and 37 of 1996 *vide* judgment dated 03.04.2001 and accordingly remanded the matter to LRA for deletion of respective extents in various survey numbers including the subject survey numbers from 'ceiling purview'. Pursuant to the said judgment dated 03.04.2001, the LRT passed order dated 05.01.2004 in C.C. No.E/1801/75, deleting various extents from ceiling purview including the subject survey numbers. As per the said order, the declarant holds land of 1.6717 SH in excess of the ceiling on the notified dated i.e., 01.01.1975.

24. As against the said order dated 05.01.2004, the Authorized Officer and Special Tahsildar (Land Reforms), Ranga Reddy District, filed an application before the LRT *vide* letter No.AO/LR/E/1801/75 dated 29.04.2004 seeking review of the order dated 05.01.2004, and the same was dismissed by the LRT *vide* order dated 26.05.2008. Aggrieved by the said order dated 26.05.2008, the Authorized Officer had preferred an appeal before the LRAT *vide* L.R.A. No.8 of 2012, which was dismissed on 23.11.2015. Thus, the order of LRT dated

05.01.2004 had attained finality. In the interregnum, *vide* Lr.No.CC/1801/E/1975, dated 26.02.2010, the Special Grade Deputy Collector & Revenue Divisional Officer, Rangareddy East Division addressed a letter to the Sub-Registrar, Vanasthalipuram, Rangareddy District, to accept documents for registration in respect of various survey numbers mentioned therein including the subject survey numbers. Pursuant to the said letter, the Sub-Registrar has been accepting the documents for registration.

25. While so, it appears that the association of the subject survey numbers layout as well as the adjacent plot owner of the petitioners made representations separately to the District Collector, Rangareddy District, with a request to delete the plots from Section 22-A of the Act, 1908. Pursuant to the said representations, the then Tahsildar, Abdullapurmet Mandal, submitted report to the District Collector through RDO, Ibrahimpatnam Rangareddy Division *vide* Lr.No.C/999920/2017, dated 03.06.2017 to the RDO, recommending for grant of NOC for Plot Nos.1 to 277 as the layout consists of total 277 plots. Despite submitting the report, the District Collector did not take any steps on the representation of adjacent land owner, he approached this Court by filing a writ petition *vide* W.P. No.13624 of

2021. *Vide* order dated 21.06.2021, this Court considering all the aforesaid aspects, directed the District Collector to consider the representation of the adjacent plot owner. The District Collector rejected the request of the adjacent plot owner. As the said order was not in compliance with the order dated 21.06.2021 in W.P. No.13624 of 2021, the adjacent plot owner filed contempt case *vide* C.C.No.1586 of 2021. During pendency of the said contempt case, the respondent got filed appeal *vide* LRA No.8 of 2022 challenging the order dated 05.01.2004 of the LRT after lapse of about eighteen (18) years. However, subject to the result of the said LRA No.8 of 2022, the then District Collector issued proceedings deleting adjacent Plot No.62 (P), 64 (P) and 74 (P) from the list of prohibitory properties under Section - 22-A of the Act, 1908. Pursuant to the said proceedings, *vide* order dated 05.09.2022, this Court closed the said C.C. No.1586 of 2021. Relying upon the said proceedings, the petitioners herein filed the writ petition and this Court also passed the order to maintain parity. During pendency of the present contempt, it is also brought to the notice of this Court that LRA No.8 of 2022 was rejected on the ground that it is barred by limitation *vide* order dated 25.04.2026. Thus, the order dated 05.01.2004 had attained finality.

26. Thus, as per the said order dated 05.01.2004 of the LRT, the lands in several survey numbers including the land in Survey No.537 were deleted. Having deleted the same, the respondent's contention that the subject plots cannot be deleted on the ground that pursuant to the order of the LRT dated 05.01.2004, no lands were reverted to the declarant under the cover of *panchanama* in Form-XI-A, and unless the procedure contemplated under Rule - 10A (6), 10A (7) and 10A (8) of the Rules, 1974, is followed by the RDO and the Tahsildar, the respondent cannot de-notify the subject lands under Section 22-A of the Act, 1908, which is self-contradictory and cannot be gone into in the contempt proceedings.

27. It is contended by the respondent in paragraph No.5 of the counter that the RDO, Hyderabad East Division has passed order *vide* No.E/1801/75, dated 08.09.1985, to take possession of the land to an extent of Acs.528.85 cents in various survey numbers including the subject survey numbers, which are surrendered or deemed to have been surrendered under Section 11 of the Act, 1973, but the respondent did not file any documentary evidence to the said effect. On the other hand, it is disputed by learned counsel for the petitioners by referring to the report submitted by the Tahsildar, Abdullapurmet

Mandal, Rangareddy District *vide* Lr.No.C/920/2017, dated 03.06.2017 to the RDO, Ibrahimpatnam Division. On one hand, the entries made in the said report do not disclose the possession of the subject survey numbers taken over by the Government; and on the other hand, right from 1954-55 onwards till 2002-03, the subject survey numbers are being shown as 'Patta'. In fact, the said report was submitted by the Tahsildar recommending to grant NOC for entire plot Nos.1 to 277 in Survey Nos.536, 537, 657 and 658 of Turkayamjal Village pursuant to the application submitted by the President of the said Colony as well as the writ petitioner in W.P. No.13624 of 2021. Pursuant to the letter No.CC/1801/E/1975, dated 26.02.2010 issued by the Special Grade Deputy Collector & Revenue Divisional Officer, Rangareddy East Division to the Sub-Registrar, Vanasthalipuram, Rangareddy District, the registering authorities had been accepting the documents for registration, including that of the petitioners herein. However, subsequently, the respondent *vide* Lr. No. E1/4034/2024 dated 27.10.2025, put the subject survey numbers except Survey No. 537 and other survey numbers covered by the aforesaid letter dated 26.02.2010 under the prohibitory properties list under Section 22A of the Act, 1908. There is no explanation to that

effect. However, all the aforesaid contentions cannot be considered in the present proceedings as it is beyond the scope of contempt.

28. It is apt to note that in paragraph No.6 of the counter affidavit filed by the respondent *vide* USR No.33014 of 2026, dated 13.03.2026, it is specifically mentioned as under:

> "…..As such the Land Reforms Tribunal has once again considered the matter and passed orders U/s 9 of the Act in C.C No E/1801/75 Dt.05-01-2004 by deleting certain lands **including the subject lands** from the holding of the declarant….."

29. In paragraph No.13 of the said counter affidavit, the respondent also contended as under:

> "…..consequent on receipt of orders from Hon'ble High Court in W.P No.22093 of 2025, Dt:05-08-2025 **this respondent with due respect to the orders, have issued notices to the applicant and also called for the relevant material from the Tahsildar, Abdullapurmet Mandal and Revenue Divisional Officer, Ibrahimpatnam Division as instructed thereon in the orders**….."

The aforesaid statement is palpably false for the following reasons:

i) As discussed above, on receipt of the order of this Court, the respondent did not pass any order within the stipulated period of sixty (60) days. Along with the counter dated 13.03.2026, the

respondent filed the copy of notice dated 17.12.2025 and also issued another notice dated 18.02.2026. Hearing was held on 21.02.2026. The column of signatures of RDO, Tahsildar and Authorized Officer, was kept blank, however petitioner No.2 was present and, therefore, he signed in the relevant column. If the RDO, Tahsildar and Authorized Officer were present in the hearing conducted on 21.02.2026, they should have signed in the appropriate column.

ii) Secondly, the copy of order was served upon the respondent on 11.08.2025. The period of sixty (60) days had expired by 10.10.2025. After waiting for the completion of the sixty (60) days period, the petitioners filed the contempt case on 15.10.2025. Therefore, the contention of the respondent that after receipt of orders from this Court, he has passed the rejection order is incorrect. Even the references mentioned in the order dated 26.02.2026 are of October 2025, January 2026 and February 2026. Thus, it is evident that only after receipt of notice in the contempt case, the respondent started the process for considering the representation of the petitioners.

30. It is also apt to note that, the very adjacent plot of the petitioners i.e., Plot No.62 (Western Part) was already deleted from the prohibitory list of properties under Section 22-A of the Act, 1908 by the then District Collector, Rangareddy District, *vide* proceedings Lr.B/E4/4345/2021 dated 27.08.2022 and the consequent Memo No.15738/G1/2022 dated 02.09.2022 issued by the District Registrar, Rangareddy District. Perusal of the record would also reveal that those proceedings were issued by the then District Collector pursuant to the order dated 21.06.2021 passed by this Court in W.P. No.13624 of 2021 and the consequential contempt proceedings in C.C. No.1586 of 2021. In fact, after compliance with the order dated 21.06.2021 in W.P.No.13624 of 2021, the said C.C. No.1586 of 2021 was closed. The subject plots and the plot No.62 (Western Part) are covered by the same layout. Learned counsel for the petitioner filed a copy of the said Layout. Further, pursuant to the orders dated 21.06.2021 in W.P. No.13624 of 2021, Plot Nos.62 (Western Part), Plot No.64 (Part) and Plot No.74 (Part) of the very same layout were deleted. The respondent did not challenge the order dated 21.06.2021 passed by this Court in W.P. No.13624 of 2021. Therefore, the said order attained finality. Relying on the said order dated 21.06.2021 and the

deletion proceedings, the petitioners filed the writ petition *vide* W.P. No.22093 of 2025. Considering the said order dated 21.06.2021 and the proceedings dated 27.08.2022 and 02.09.2022, this Court passed the order dated 05.08.2025 in W.P. No.22093 of 2025, which is under contempt. The relevant extract of the order under contempt is as under:

> "4. Perusal of record would reveal that vide order dated 21.06.2021 in W.P.No.13624 of 2021, this Court directed the 3rd respondent - District Collector to consider the claim of the petitioner therein to delete Plot No.62 (part), Plot No.64 (part) and Plot No.74 (Part) covered by the subject Layout consists of the aforesaid Survey Numbers from the List of Prohibitory Properties and dispose of the said request made by the petitioner therein. If he is not inclined to accept the request made by the petitioner therein, he shall pass orders duly assigning reasons and communicate copy of the said order to the petitioner therein, he shall pass orders duly assigning reasons and communicate copy of the said order to the petitioner therein.
>
> 5. Pursuant to the said order, dated 21.06.2021 in W.P. No.13624 of 2021 and the consequential contempt proceedings in C.C.No.1586 of 2021, the 3rd respondent has taken steps for deletion of the aforesaid plots from the list of prohibitory properties *vide* proceedings Lr.B/E4/4345/2021, dated 27.08.2022 subject to the result of LRA No.8 of 2022. On receipt of the said proceedings

> dated 27.08.2022, respondent No2 issued a Memo No.G3/8684/2022, dated 09.09.2022 to respondent No.6 to take further necessary action as per Act and Rules in vogue. Pursuant to the said Memo, dated 02.09.2022 of respondent No. 2, *vide* Memo No.15738/G1/2022, dated 02.09.2022, respondent No.6 deleted Plot Nos.62 (Part), 64 (Part) and 74 (Part) in Survey Nos.536, 537, 657 and 658, situated at Manne Muthyalamma Kunta, Turkayamjal Village and now under Municipality, Abdullapurmet Mandal, Rangareddy District. Therefore, the petitioners herein are also standing on the very same footing. To maintain parity, they are also entitled for the same relief."

31. The aforesaid order under contempt was passed by this Court only after hearing both sides. During the course of hearing in the said writ petition, the respondent did not take any plea which has been raised in the present contempt case. The respondent neither preferred any appeal against the order under contempt nor took any such plea in the writ petition. In the order under contempt, this Court directed the respondent to complete the entire exercise within sixty (60) days from the date of receipt of the copy of the order. Despite receipt of the said order, the respondent did not pass any order within the stipulated time. There is no explanation, much less plausible explanation to that effect. Thus, the action of the respondent amounts

to willful disobedience and violation of the order under contempt. Further, the respondent passed the rejection order on 26.02.2026, which is only after receipt of notice in the contempt case.

32. Perusal of the said order dated 26.02.2026 would disclose that there is neither reference nor consideration with regard to the proceedings passed by the then District Collector deleting the adjacent Plot No.62 (Part) from the prohibitory list of properties under Section 22-A of the Act, 1908. As stated above, even in the subsequent proceedings dated 08.07.2026 passed by the respondent, it is mentioned that adjacent plot and other two plots were deleted from the list of prohibited properties without complying with the statutory procedure prescribed under the Rules, 1974. It is not fair on the part of the respondent to make such contentions in the contempt proceedings without challenging the order dated 21.06.2021 in W.P. No.13624 of 2021 and the order dated 05.08.2025 in W.P. No.22093 of 2025, as roving inquiry is impermissible in contempt proceedings as held by the Apex Court in **Jalim Singh**[1]. The said contention of the respondent is also against the principle laid down by the Apex Court in **Subedar Devassy PV**[2], wherein it was held that if any party concerned is aggrieved by the order which in its opinion is wrong or

against the rules or its implementation is neither practicable nor feasible, it should always either approach the court that passed the order or invoke jurisdiction of the appellate court. **Rightness or wrongness of the order cannot be urged in contempt proceedings**. **Right or wrong, the order has to be obeyed. Flouting an order of the court would render the party liable for contempt**.

33. There is also no explanation as to why the respondent deleted Survey No.537 out of the four subject survey numbers and several other survey numbers as per the order dated 05.01.2004 of the LRT. On one hand, the respondent deletes Survey No.537 and several other survey numbers from the prohibitory list of properties under Section 22-A of the Act, 1908 without following the procedure as contemplated under the Rules, 1974; while on the other hand, opposes the deletion of subject plots from Section 22-A of the Act, 1908 without any valid ground. However, the said contentions cannot be considered in the present contempt proceedings.

34. In the light of the aforesaid discussion, it is clear that the order under contempt passed by this Court directing the respondent to consider the request made by the petitioners in terms of the decision of

the then District Collector, Rangareddy District *vide* Lr.B/E4/4345/2021 dated 27.08.2022 and the consequential Memo No.15738/G1/2022 dated 02.09.2022 issued by the District Registrar, Rangareddy District, is not complied with. Pursuant to the said proceedings, adjacent plot and other two plots were deleted from the prohibitory list of properties under Section 22-A of the Act, 1908. Therefore, instead of implementing the order under contempt in such manner, the respondent had disobeyed the same, despite granting sufficient opportunity. Thus, the act of the respondent amounts to willful and deliberate disobedience and violation of the order under contempt. The explanation offered by the respondent is unsatisfactory and the same cannot be accepted.

35. In the light of the aforesaid discussion, this Court is of the considered view that the respondent has committed willful and deliberate violation of the order dated 05.08.2025 passed by this Court in W.P. No.22093 of 2025 and he is liable for punishment in terms of Section - 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

36. The present Contempt Case is accordingly allowed. The respondent is sentenced to suffer simple imprisonment for a period of six (06) months and to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/- (Rupees Two

Thousand Only) within 04 (four) weeks from today. However, the sentence of imprisonment is suspended for a period of four (04) weeks from today. In the circumstances of the case, there shall be no order as to costs.

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

K. LAKSHMAN, J

30th October, 2026
Mgr