*** THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI**
&
*** THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR**

\+ **CONTEMPT APPEAL No.14 of 2026**

IN

CONTEMPT CASE No.1936 of 2024

% 11.11.2026

Between:
K Raja Reddy

.....APPELLANT

AND

Koneti Prakash, S/o Israil, Aged 48 years,R/o,H-No.91289, Sagar Street,Allagadda Town and Mandal,Nandyal District, Andhra Pradesh

.....RESPONDENT

! Counsel for the Appellant : Sri T.M.K Chaitanya.

Counsel for the Respondent : Sri Ravula Nagarjuna.

< Gist :

> Head Note:

? Cases Referred:

1. **(2010) 3 SCC 705**
2. **(2004) 5 Supreme Court Cases 334**

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

* * * *

CONTEMPT APPEAL No.14 of 2026

IN

CONTEMPT CASE No.1936 of 2024

Between:
K Raja Reddy

.....APPELLANT

AND

Koneti Prakash, S/o Israil, Aged 48 years,R/o,H-No.91289, Sagar Street,Allagadda Town and Mandal,Nandyal District, Andhra Pradesh

.....RESPONDENT

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
&
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers may be allowed to see the Judgments? Yes/No

2. Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reporters/Journals Yes/No

3. Whether Your Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment? Yes/No

RAVI NATH TILHARI, J

ALAPATI GIRIDHAR, J

APHC010544222026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI

WEDNESDAY, THE 11th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR

CONTEMPT APPEAL NO: 14 OF 2026

IN

CONTEMPT CASE NO:1936 OF 2024

Between:

1. K Raja Reddy, S/o K.Venkata reddy, Aged 45 years,Occ Circle Inspector of Police,Nandyala II Town Police Station,Nandyala District.Presently working SHO I Town Madanapalli,Sri Satya Sai District

...APPLICANT

AND

1. Koneti Prakash, S/o Israil, Aged 48 years,R/o,H-No.91289, Sagar Street,Allagadda Town and Mandal,Nandyal District, Andhra Pradesh.

...RESPONDENT

pleased to allow the Contempt Appeal by setting aside the order dt.03-07-2026 in C.C.No.1936 of 2024 preferred against the order in W.P.No.32906 of 2023, passed against the appellant, passed by Her ladyship, against the appellant/contemnor 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

pleased to dispense with Xerox Copy of the order dated 03-07-2026 passed in C.C.N0.1936 of 2024 preferred against the order in W.P.No.32906 of 2023, on the file of , and 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 pleased to suspend the order dt.03-07-2026 in C.C.No.1936 of 2024 preferred agasint the order in W.P.No.32906 of 2023 and pass

Counsel for the Applicant: T M K CHAITANYA

Counsel for the Respondent

The Court made the following Judgment:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR

CONTEMPT APPEAL No.14 of 2026

IN

CONTEMPT CASE No.1936 of 2024

JUDGMENT: *(per Ravi Nath Tilhari, J)*

Heard Sri T.M.K Chaitanya, learned counsel for the appellant and Sri Ravula Nagarjuna, learned counsel for the respondent.

2. The appellant is the respondent No.3 in C.C.No.1936 of 2024, filed by the writ petitioner (respondent herein), in W.P.No.32906 of 2023.

3. W.P.No.32906 of 2023 was filed with the following prayer:

> *"…to issue an appropriate Writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents 5 to 7 in pressurizing the petitioner to settle the civil and criminal disputes with the unofficial Respondents no. 8 and 9 as arbitrary, illegal, unwarranted and violation of Article 14, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequentially direct the Respondents 5 to 7 not to harass the petitioner and not to interfere with the civil disputes and peaceful possession of the petitioner's land in Sy No. 408/2 pyki Ex: Ac 0.09.945 cents or 481.33 Sq. Yards situated in NGO's Colony, Viswa Nagar, Municipal Limits of Nandyal, Nandyal District and pass…"*

4. The learned Single Judge on consideration of the submissions advanced by the learned counsels for the petitioner, and the official respondent Nos.1, 3 to 6 in the writ petition, disposed of the writ petition

vide order dated 14.01.2024, paragraph Nos.2 to 6 of which reads as under:

"2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home appearing for respondent Nos.1, 3 to 6.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the police are unnecessarily interfering in the civil disputes and raised a board in the disputed property. Though there is a civil case pending, they are trying to dispossess the petitioner and handover possession of theproperty to the outside party.

4. The learned Assistant Government Pleader for Home, on written instructions, submitted that in the year 1968, the children of 1st wife that is Boyina Nagamma and Chilakala Subbamma filed O.S.No.29 of1968 on the file of the Additional Sub Ordinate Judge, Kurnool, for their share of property. The suit was decreed on 21.12.1970 and thus, they took their share of property of Ac.0-43 cents. Out of the same, some transactions took place subsequently. He further submitted that on 07.12.2023, in the afternoon, the 6th respondent, on knowing that the petitioner along with some others and the respondents gathered at the disputed land, visited the same place along with the staff to avoid untoward incidents and to maintain law and order, but he has never interfered with the civil disputes. Learned Assistant Government Pleader further submitted that due to the incident happened on 07.12.2023, the 6th respondent sent a requisition to the Tahsildar, Nandyal Mandal and District to issue orders under Section 145 of Code of Criminal Procedure, but the police have not done any illegal act. It is also submitted by him that on the complaint of Boyini Chinna Pullaiah, a case was registered vide Cr.No.237 of 2023 under Section 420, 447, 506 read with 34 of Indian Penal Code of Nandyal II town Urban Police Station and the case is under investigation. Hence, requested to close the writ petition.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner requested to record the submissions that the police are not interfering with the civil disputes and dispose of the writ petition by directing the police not to interfere with the civil disputes.

6. In view of the submissions on both sides, as the police stated that except for the purpose of investigation in the case already registered and in view of the incident that happened on that particular day they visited the disputed site, ***the Writ Petition is disposed of with a direction to the police not to interfere with the civil dispute****. However, this order does not prevent the police to conduct investigation in the case*

which is already registered or to proceed as per law in case of any future incidents. No costs."

5. It is evident from the aforesaid order that the statement of the learned Assistant Government Pleader for the official respondent Nos.1, 3 to 6, was recorded that the dispute being civil dispute, the Police was not interfering in the civil dispute of the parties, (vide para Nos.4 & 5).

6. The writ petitioner filed contempt petition, C.C.No.1936 of 2024, against three (3) respondents/respondent Nos.1, 3, 5 in the writ petition), alleging willful disobedience of the order dated 04.01.2024, whereby, "a direction to the Police, not to interfere with the civil dispute", was issued.

7. Notice was issued to the respondents in the contempt case. The respondent Nos.1 to 3 in the contempt case filed the counter affidavit.

8. The learned Single Judge by judgment dated 03.07.2026, recording the finding that the respondent No.3 in the contempt case (present appellant) committed contempt, imposed the punishment to pay a fine a Rs.1,000/-. The relevant part in paragraph Nos.10 and 11 of the judgment dated 03.07.2026, is being reproduced as under:

"10. As can be seen from the contents of the counter, the respondent No.3 justified his letter stating that it was not a contempt and was intended only to maintain law and order and public tranquility and was not intentional to violate the order. The letter of the respondent No. 3, dated 11.03.2024, does not refer to any specific complaint after the order of this Court. On the other hand, it refers to the incident, dated 08.12.2023 and complaint, dated 15.12.2023. He further stated that a request was made to the Mandal Executive Magistrate, Nandyal to issue order under Section 145 Cr.P.C. as there was

likelihood of occurrence of law and order problem. Though he stated that recently an electric meter was fitted to the disputed site in the name of Koneti Prakash, no date was given. Therefore, it is not known whether the alleged incident was prior or subsequent to the order of this Court. Under these circumstances, the letter of the respondent No.3 is in clear violation of the order of this Court. Therefore, the respondent No. 3, having knowledge of the order, willfully and intentionally violated the order and is liable to be punished.

11. Accordingly, the contempt case is allowed and the respondent No.3 / contemnor is sentenced to pay a fine of Rs.1,000/- (Rupees one thousand only) on or before 17.07.2026.

The contempt case as against the respondents Nos. 1 & 2 is dismissed as not pressed."

9. Against the respondent Nos.1 and 2, the contempt case was dismissed as not pressed by final order dated 03.07.2026.

10. Challenging the order dated 03.07.2026; the present contempt appeal has been filed by the respondent No.3 in the contempt case.

11. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the procedure was not followed. The contempt proceedings are *Quasi Criminal*. The charge was not framed. The appellant had no ample opportunity to defend. The material placed on record along with the counter in the contempt petition was not considered. Learned counsel placed reliance in Section 14 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 and in the Judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Sahdeo @ Sahdeo Singh Vs. State of U.P. and Others***[1]***.*** To

[1] **(2010) 3 SCC 705**

contend that without framing the charge, the impugned order cannot be sustained.

12. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant wrote a letter dated 11.03.2024, to the Assistant Engineer of A.P.S.P.D.C.L., Nandyal, in good faith, in view of the ongoing investigation, in order to resolve the dispute and to maintain peace and order.

13. Learned counsel for the respondent No.1 (the contempt petitioner) submits that the appellant himself wrote a letter dated 11.03.2024, for disconnection of the electricity on the subject property. He submits that the electricity was disconnected and in this way, the appellant interfered with the civil rights of the contempt petitioner, in spite of the clear directions of this Court to the Police not to interfere with the civil dispute. He submits that there is no illegality in the order, convicting the appellant guilty of Contempt of Court and imposing the punishment which is justified.

14. We have considered the aforesaid submissions of the learned counsel for the parties and perused the material on record.

15. There is no dispute that the writ petition was disposed of with a direction to the Police not to interfere with the civil dispute. The learned Single Judge held that under the circumstances, the letter of the appellant

dated 11.03.2024 is in clear violation of the order of the writ Court. The appellant having knowledge of the order willfully and intentionally violated the order.

16. The letter dated 11.03.2024 of the appellant reads as under:

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
POLICE DEPARTMENT

From:
K. Raja Reddy.
Inspector of Police,
Nandyal II town Ups

To
Sri. Ramaiah, A.E.,
APSPDCL
Nandyal.

Sir,

Sub:- Cases Criminal Cases Request to disconnect the service meter fitted In the disputed site in survey number 408 of Nunepalli (v) Nandyal (M) situated at NGOs colony. Nandyal town-Submission Regarding.

Ref:- Nandyal II town UPS Cr.No. 237/2023, U/sec.420, 447, 506 r/w 34 IPC.

--ooo--

With reference to the above cited a case has been registered in Nandyal II town UPS and the case is under Investigation. The brief facts of the case are as follows.

This is a case of cheating, trespass into the site of complainant. threatened them with dire consequence with common Intention that they will see their end that occurred on 08.12.2023 at 12.30 hours in Survey No.408 situated in Viswa Nagar and reported in the PS on 15.12.2023 at 19.15 hours by the complainant Boyini Chinna Pullalah, age 62 yrs, S/o Boyini Balalah. resident of H.No.29/119, Opposite to Nagulakatta. Tekke Street, Nandyal town & District, wherein the accused A.1 Koneti Prakash, A.2 Shaik Kallmulla, A.3 Ponnapati Dibbanna, A.4. Koneti Ravi Kumar, A.5. Gullakunta Sanjay, A.6. Lingamaiah and A.7. Ravi Chandra Reddy all are of Allagadda town were trespassed into the site of complainant and threatened him with dire consequences to see this end while the complainant surveying his land by the Govt. Surveyor by stating that said site belongs to A.1 by cheating that the said site belongs to the elder sister Chilakala Subbamma and got registered on his name, the complainant surveying without informing and serving notice to him by the A.1. This is due to land dispute between A.1 and family members of complainant and etc.

In this case Investigation is not yet completed and a requisition was submitted to the Mandal Executive Magistrate, Nandyal to Issue orders under section 145 Cr.P.C. over the disputed site situated In S.No. 408 of Nunepalli (V) Nandyal (M) situated at NGOs colony, Nandyal town as there is likelihood of occurrence of law and order problem.

Further it is learnt that recently the electric service meter was fitted in the above disputed site on the name of A.1 Konetl Prakash bearing USC No. 8431205107915

(S.C.No. 107915) without the notice of Police department though there is dispute over the above site. Installation of electric meter in the disputed site may create Law and Order problem to Police department.

Hence it is requested to remove the electric service meter bearing USC No. 8431205107915 (S.C.No. 107915) fitted in the disputed land situated in S.No.408 of Nunepalli (V). Nandyal (M) to avert the occurrence of untoward Incidents.

Yours faithfully,

(K.Raja Reddy)
Inspector of Police,
Nandyal II town UPS
Dt. 11.03.2024.

17. In ***Sahdeo @ Sahdeo Singh*** (supra), upon which learned counsel for the appellant placed reliance, Rule 5 of the Chapter XXXV-E of the Allahabad High Court Rules, 1952 was referred. Paragraph Nos.20 and 21 of the judgment reads as under:

"20. In view of the above, the law can be summarised that the High Court has a power to initiate the contempt proceedings suo motu for ensuring the compliance of the orders passed by the Court. However, contempt proceedings being quasi-criminal in nature, the same standard of proof is required in the same manner as in other criminal cases. The alleged contemnor is entitled to the protection of all safeguards/rights which are provided in the Criminal Jurisprudence, including the benefit of doubt. There must be a clear-cut case of obstruction of administration of justice by a party intentionally to bring the matter within the ambit of the said provision. The alleged contemnor is to be informed as what is the charge, he has to meet. Thus, specific charge has to be framed in precision. The alleged contemnor may ask the Court to permit him to cross-examine the witnesses i.e. deponents of affidavits, who have deposed against him. In spite of the fact that contempt proceedings are quasi-criminal in nature, provisions of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter called, "Cr.P.C.") and Evidence Act are not attracted for the reason that proceedings have to be concluded expeditiously. Thus, the trial has to be concluded as early as possible. The case should not rest only on surmises and conjectures. There must be clear and reliable evidence to substantiate the allegations against the alleged contemnor. The proceedings must be concluded giving strict adherence to the statutory Rules framed for the purpose.

21. The instant cases are required to be examined in view of the aforesaid settled legal proposition. The contempt proceedings had been initiated under the Act, 1971. Section 23 of the Act 1971 enables the High Court to frame rules providing for a procedure in contempt cases. In view thereof, the Allahabad High Court framed the rules by adding ***chapter XXXV-E in the Allahabad High Court Rules, 1952*** *(hereinafter called the `Rules 1952') vide amendment published in Uttar Pradesh Gazette, Part II dated 12.2.1977. As per the said rules, a criminal contempt is to be dealt with by the Division Bench and a detailed procedure to file the application etc. has been laid down therein. Once the Court is prima facie satisfied that there is a case to proceed with the contempt against a person concerned, the Division Bench in such case has to proceed giving strict adherence to the procedure prescribed under the Rules 1952.* ***Rule 5 of the Chapter XXXV-E*** *reads as under:-*

> *"5.* ***Issuance of notice****. - Such allegations contained in the petition as appears to the Court to make out a prima facie case of contempt of Court against the person concerned,* ***shall be reduced into charge or charges by the Court against such person,*** *and* ***notice shall be issued only with respect to those charges****.*
>
> *Rule 6 thereof provides mandatorily that the show cause notice issued under Rule 5 must be accompanied with material documents. The Rule reads as under:-*
>
> *"6. Documents accompanied notice. - Where an order has been made directing that notice be issued to any person to show cause why he should not be punished for contempt of Court, a date shall be fixed for the hearing and a notice thereof in the prescribed form given to the person concerned. The notice of a criminal contempt shall also be served on the Government Advocate. The notice shall be accompanied by copies of the application, motion and the affidavit or a copy of the reference by a subordinate court as the case may be, and a copy of the charge or charges as framed by the Court, and shall require the person concerned to appear, unless otherwise ordered, in person before the Court at the time and on the date specified therein to show cause why he should not be punished for Contempt of Court. Notice of every proceeding under Section 15 of the Act shall be served personally on the person charged, unless the Court for reasons to be recorded directs otherwise."*
>
> ***Thus, it is evident that while initiating contempt proceedings the Court has to frame the charge (s) and serve the same alongwith other relevant material upon the alleged contemnor. This is a mandatory requirement under the Rules 1952."***

18. ***Sahdeo*** @ ***Sahdeo Singh*** (supra), was a case of Criminal Contempt and Rule 5 of the Allahabad High Court Rules, 1952, clearly provided for "framing of charge or charges' by the Court against the person concerned and to issue notice only with respect to those charges.

The Hon'ble Apex Court held that while initiating contempt proceedings, the Court has to frame the charge(s) and serve the same along with other relevant material upon the alleged contemnor which was a mandatory requirement under the Rules, 1952.

19. In the State of Andhra Pradesh, the rules to regulate the proceedings for contempt, namely The Contempt of Courts (Andhra Pradesh High Court) Rules, 1980, (in short, 'the A.P. Rules, 1980'), have been framed under Section 23 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

20. Rule-18 of the A.P. Rules, 1980, reads as under:

> *"**Rule - 18.***
>
> ***Notice of every contempt case, if ordered by court for service on the contemner, shall be in Form I** and shall be accompanied by one set of all papers filed in the case and the said notice with all enclosures shall be served personally on the alleged contemner, unless the court otherwise directs for reasons to be recorded, requiring him to appear in person, unless otherwise ordered, on a day fixed, which shall be not less than four weeks from the date of the order or as fixed by the court, for hearing of the proceeding and to show cause why he may not be suitably punished under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 and he shall continue to remain present during the hearing till the proceeding finally disposed of by order of the court, unless otherwise directed:*
>
> *Provided that the Court, on an application made by the contemner, before the date fixed for his appearance in the notice, to dispense with his personal appearance in court, may, for sufficient cause, dispense with his personal appearance and permit him to appear by his pleader."*

21. The Rule 18 therefore provides for notice of every contempt case, if ordered by Court, to be in Form-I, which is being reproduced as under:

FORM I

NOTICE TO A PERSON CHARGED WITH CONTEMPT OF COURT

[See Rule 18]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

[Original Jurisdiction]

Contempt Case No…….. of …….

……. …….

Petitioner

Versus

……. …….

Respondent

To

Whereas your attendance is necessary to **answer a charge of Contempt of Court**, viz:

(**here briefly state the nature of the Contempt**)

You, Sri ……, are hereby required to appear in person (or by Advocate if the Court has so ordered) before this Court at Hyderabad on the ……. day of…… 19…….at…….a.m. and show cause why you shall not be punished or other appropriate order be not passed against you for contempt of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh/Subordinate Court (Name of Court).

You shall attend this Court at Hyderabad in person1 on the……. day of…… 19 …….at……a.m. and shall continue to attend the Court on all days thereafter to which the case against you stands adjourned and until final orders are passed on the charge against you.

Herein fail not.

Dated this ……. day of …… 19 ……

(Seal)

Registrar

22. Form-I provides *"Whereas your attendance is necessary to answer a charge of Contempt of Court, viz: (here briefly state the nature of the*

Contempt)". So, framing of a specific charge for contempt by the Court is not necessary. Rule 5 of the Allahabad High Court Rules is clear for framing of the charge by the Court. In view of the rule position, in the State of Andhra Pradesh in brief, the nature of the contempt is to be stated for which the attendance is necessary to answer. Consequently, we are of the view that framing of a specific charge by the Court is not necessary, but statement of the nature of the contempt is sufficient.

23. In ***Dalbir Singh Vs. State of U.P.***[2]***,*** where accused was charged under Section 302 IPC, but was convicted under Section 306 IPC without there being any charge for Section 306 IPC, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that, it was possible to convict an accused for an offence for which the charge was framed unless the Court was of an opinion that a failure of Justice would occasion for which it would be relevant to examine if the accused was aware of the basic facts and he got a fair opportunity to defend. Para No.17 reads as under:

> *"**17**. There are a catena of decisions of this Court on the same lines and it is not necessary to burden this judgment by making reference to each one of them. Therefore, in view of Section 464 Cr.P.C., it is possible for the appellate or revisional Court to convict an accused for an offence for which no charge was framed unless the Court is of the opinion that a failure of justice would in fact occasion. In order to judge whether a failure of justice has been occasioned, it will be relevant to examine whether the accused was aware of the basic ingredients of the offence for which he is being convicted and whether the main facts sought to be established against him were explained to him clearly and whether he got a fair chance to defend himself. We are,*

[2] **(2004) 5 Supreme Court Cases 334**

therefore, of the opinion that Sangarabonia Sreenu (supra) was not correctly decided as it purports to lay down as a principle of law that where the accused is charged under Section 302 IPC, he cannot be convicted for the offence under Section 306 IPC."

24. Notice was issued, in the contempt case, to the appellant. He filed the response/counter affidavit. Any plea, either of non-framing of the charge; or the prejudice, if any, caused due to non-framing of the charge, was not raised. The copy of the contempt petition was served. It clearly mentioned in Paragraph No.5 about the nature of contempt and violation of the Court order by the appellant, writing letter to Assistant Engineer, Electricity Department dated 11.03.2024. Paragraph 5 of the contempt petition is as under:

*"**5.** It is further submitted that even though having received the said communication OF THE Order the respondent herein not shown any interest for implementing the orders of this Hon'ble court. Having waited patiently with fond hope that the respondent obviously would implement the orders of this Hon'ble court **but inspite of communication of Orders of this Honble High Court the Respondent on 11.03.2024 willfully and deliberately wrote a letter to AE, Electricity Department to remove the electric meter in the Property of the Petitioner which is the subject matter of Civil Suit vide O.S No. 1070/2023 as well violating the Orders of this Honble High Court."***

25. The appellant filed the counter in the contempt case, denying the contents. He specifically submitted that there was no violation of the Court's order. He tried to justify his action in various paragraphs of the counter affidavit. Paragraph Nos.5, 6 & 8 of the counter in Contempt Case are reproduced as under:

"5. In reply to Para no.5 it is submitted that the allegation that the respondent on 11-03-2024 willfully and deliberately wrote a letter to Assistant Engineer, Electricity dept. to remove the electric meter in the property of the petitioner is hereby specifically denied and submits that ***it was addressed in consequence to the ongoing dispute site in Survey No. 408/2*** *in Viswanagar, Nandyal. It is pertinent to mention here that on 25-02-2024 at about 6.35 p.m. when we reached vacant land sold by Boyina Pullaiah in Viswanagar, we saw some people standing in two groups by seeing police jeep they ran away. When we enquired from the surrounding people, it is learnt that in pursuance to current connection issued on 23-02-2024, since then people forming as two groups and roaming around and they belongs to Allagadda and Banaganapalli. It is further submitted that they told that they do not know the names of the people since the current meter is fixed and there is scope for altercation in between two groups for which they are afraid off. Thereafter return to the police station and made an entry in General Diary.*

It is further submitted that on 10-03-2024 also, at about 1:00PM similar thing happened, and the same was entered in to General Diary. ***It is learnt that the surrounding people expressed that if the current meter will be removed from the disputed site the things may decrease down. It is further submitted that to avert any untoward incidents at the disputed open site situated Sy.No.408/2 and to control law and order and keeping in view the above situation, the 3rd respondent addressed a letter on 11-03-2024 to Asst. Engineer APSPDCL, D2 Section AE, Kurnool District was sent through police constable.***

6. It is respectfully submitted that the power connection granted to the petitioner in an open site situated at Sy. No. 408/2, ***the petitioner had executed an indemnity bond dated 20-02-2024 to the APSPDCL undertaking that the APTRANCO is at liberty to disconnect the service connection and cancel the transfer executed in his name****. It is further submitted that after receipt of the letter addressed to the Electricity Department by the 3rd respondent, the electricity department obtained the legal opinion from their panel advocate. As per the suggestion given by the panel advocate to better disconnect the electricity connection bearing No. 1600275 given to the property of Koneti Ravi Prakash/Petitioner. Basing upon the legal opinion the electricity department disconnected the power supply from the open site situated in Sy. No. 408/2 in Vishwa Nagar.*

7. ….

8. It is respectfully submitted that it is an admitted fact that Cr.No. 237 of 2023 U/S 420.447,506 R/W 34 IPC dated 15-12-2023, was pending against the petitioner and

others and therefore as a part of investigation due to the situation demanded to ensure maintenance of law and order at that particular site, ***3rd respondent addressed a letter to the APSPDCL to disconnect the power supply in view*** *of crime and repeated gatherings at the site and disturbance of the public tranquility thought fit to resolve the problem for controlling the situation over there. It is further submitted that* ***the issuance of letter to the electricity department is not intentional on the part of the 3rd respondent nor to violate the Hon'ble Court order but only due to the above situation, which does not amount to contempt****. It is further submitted that this Hon'ble Court in the order of the Writ Petition categorically observed that the police are not prevented from conducting investigation in the criminal case which is already registered and pending.* ***The above said act of the 3rd respondent is within the para meter of the order granted by this Hon'ble Court and cannot construe as contempt****."*

26. The above contents of the counter affidavit filed in the contempt case, make it very clear that the appellant knew the nature of the contempt. Consequently, it cannot be stated that the contempt appellant was not aware about the contents or the nature of the disobedience. He had full knowledge of the contents. He also submitted the reply on that aspect. The contents and the nature of the contempt were fully known to the appellant. He not only replied but defended and also justified his action by taking shelter of the 'investigation part' whereas; connection or disconnection of electricity is a civil dispute. There is also no question of 'no opportunity'. Opportunity was given and he filed counter affidavit, but at the time of hearing, he had chosen not to appear, which has been recorded in the order of the learned Single Judge in "Paragraph No.8" as follows:

"8. There was no representation for the respondents."

27. In view of the above consideration, we are satisfied that even if charge was required to be framed but was not specifically framed, no prejudice has been caused to the appellant. He knew the contents of the contempt and had the opportunity to defend and defended by filing counter affidavit with material documents without raising any grievance on that aspect.

28. The, learned Single Judge in paragraph No.10, has further recorded that *"Therefore, it is not known whether the alleged incident was prior or subsequent to the order of this Court. Under these circumstances, the letter of the respondent No.3 is in clear violation of the order of this Court."* With respect to the aforesaid, we specifically asked the learned counsel for the appellant, about the date of connection of the electricity on the subject property. He submits that the 'Indemnity Bond' was filed by the contempt petitioner (Page No.59), which mentions the execution of the Indemnity Bond, on 20.02.2024, so, he submits that the electricity connection was on 20.02.2024, i.e. after the judgment dated 04.01.2024 in the writ petition. However, a perusal of the Indemnity Bond shows that it was filed in respect of change of the service connection in his name.

INDEMNITY BOND

"1. This Deed of Indemnity executed on this the 20th day of February Month, 2024 by Sri/Smt KONETI PRAKASH (Name) S/o KONETI ISRAIEL Residing at NGO's Colony, Nandyal Town & Mandal, Nandyal District here after called the indemnified (which term

shall mean and include Executers, administrators, heirs, successor and assignees) to in favour of the Andhra Pradesh Southern Power Distribution Company Limited, hereinafter called the Beard (Which term means shall mean and include its successors in office and assigner.

2. Whereas the indemnifier has requested APSPDCL to change a service connection bearing No. in his/ her name subject to execution of an indemnity bond by him indemnifying the board against any damage or loss caused to the board in respect of the service connection in his name."

29. In any case, in our view, the date of the connection is not relevant. The connection or the disconnection is a civil dispute between the parties, may be with the Electricity Department as well. But once there was a clear direction to the Police not to interfere with the civil dispute, the appellant had no business to write the letter to the Electricity Department for the disconnection. The learned Single Judge has rightly appreciated, the appellant's letter dated 11.03.2024 in holding that the appellant committed Contempt of Court.

30. The contention relating to non-consideration of the material documents referring to the copies of Case Diary and other material papers annexed to the contempt appeal, in our view, were not relevant for the purposes of the contempt case, and were rightly not taken into consideration which had no effect on the ultimate judgment .

31. Section 14 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 is, not on the point involved in this appeal.

32. We are satisfied that the appellant committed Contempt of Court, of the order dated 04.01.2024, passed in W.P.No.32906 of 2023. The learned Single Judge has rightly held him guilty of the contempt and imposed the punishment. No case for interference is made out.

33. The contempt appeal is dismissed.

34. The Registrar (Judicial) shall proceed as per law to ensure the compliance of the order dated 03.07.2026 passed in the contempt case No.1936 of 2024 against the contempt appellant (respondent No.3 in the Contempt Case), on expiry of a period of three (3) weeks from today, if there is no stay order or an order to the contrary.

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

RAVI NATH TILHARI,J

ALAPATI GIRIDHAR,J

Dated: 11.11.2026
SRT
Note:
L.R. copy to be marked

B/o
SRT

226

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR

CONTEMPT APPEAL No.14 of 2026

&

CONTEMPT CASE No.1936 of 2024

Dated: 11.11.2026

Note:
L.R. copy to be marked

B/o
SRT