

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

**THURSDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE C.V. BHASKAR REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE NO: 1563 OF 2025

Contempt Case filed Under Sections 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 to punish the respondents herein for violating and disobeying the directions of the High Court dated 18-02-2025 passed in W.P. No. 4744 of 2025.

Between:

Nawab Mohd Yousufuddin Khan, S/o. Late NawabWajiuddin Khan, aged about 69 years, Occ Landlord, R/o. H. No. 19-3-262/2/5. Jahanuma, Hyderabad

...Petitioner

AND

Sri Koppula Venkat Reddy, S/o. Not Known Authorized officer-cum-Revenue Divisional Officer, Land Reforms Tribunal, Attapur, Rajendranagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

...Respondent

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 under the 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, for willful wantonly, intentionally not obeying violated the orders of the Hon'ble Court in W.P.No. 4744 of 2025 dated 18-02-2025.

Counsel for the Petitioner : Smt. Jyothi Eswar Gogineni

Counsel for the Respondent : GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following : ORDER

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

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.BHASKAR REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE No.1563 of 2025

Date: 16.04.2026

Between:

Nawab Mohd Yousufuddin Khan.

.....Petitioner

AND

Sri Koppula Venkat Reddy S/o. Not Known.
Authorized officer-cum-Revenue Divisional Officer,
Land Reforms Tribunal, Attapur,
Rajendranagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

....Respondent

ORDER

This Contempt Case is filed by the petitioner seeking to punish the respondent/contemnor (Revenue Divisional Officer) under Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 for wilfully, wantonly and intentionally not obeying the order dated 18.02.2025 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.4744 of 2025.

2. The petitioner herein has filed Writ Petition No.4744 of 2025 seeking a direction to the respondent to pass orders in C.C.Nos.W/80/75 and W/92/75 in respect of land admeasuring Ac.74.97 cents in Sy.Nos.174 to 176, 178, 182, 183 and 154 situated at Peddashapur Village, Shamshabad Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. It is the case of the petitioner that the subject lands originally belonged to

his predecessor and that the matter was remanded by the Land Reforms Appellate Tribunal-cum-II Additional District Judge, Ranga Reddy District in L.R.A.No.10 of 2012 dated 04.04.2017 for fresh adjudication. Despite completion of hearing and reserving the matter for orders on 02.11.2024, no orders were passed by the respondent, which constrained the petitioner to approach this Court by filing the aforesaid writ petition.

3. This Court *vide* order dated 18.02.2025 disposed of W.P.No.4744 of 2025 directing the respondent No.3 therein/respondent herein to pass orders in C.C.Nos.W/80/75 and W/92/75 strictly in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of six (06) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order and to communicate the decision to the petitioner.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that despite the aforesaid direction, the respondent failed to pass orders within the stipulated time and therefore, the present Contempt Case is filed.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent has willfully and deliberately disobeyed the orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.4744 of 2025. It is contended that though this Court, *vide* order dated 18.02.2025, directed the respondent to pass orders within a period of six weeks, the respondent failed to adhere to the said time frame and did not pass any orders even long after expiry

of the stipulated period. It is further submitted that the petitioner, having no other alternative, made a representation dated 25.03.2025 bringing to the notice of the respondent the directions issued by this Court and requesting early compliance, but the same did not evoke any response. It is contended that the conduct of the respondent clearly demonstrates lack of respect to the orders of this Court and amounts to intentional and willful disobedience. The learned counsel would further submit that the proceedings dated 24.02.2026, which are now relied upon by the respondent, were passed only after initiation of contempt proceedings and issuance of notice in Form-I by this Court, and therefore, the same cannot be treated as *bona fide* compliance. It is contended that the said proceedings dated 24.02.2026 was issued only to escape the consequences of contempt, without examining the matter in proper perspective. The learned counsel contended that the respondent failed to consider the remand order passed in L.A.R.No.10 of 2012 dated 04.04.2017, wherein the earlier orders were set aside and the matter was remitted for fresh adjudication. It is further contended that the respondent ignored the documentary evidence placed by the petitioner, including the allotment of the subject land in favour of the petitioner's predecessor under the proceedings in C.S No.7 of 1958, and the subsequent confirmation of rights by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court. It is further argued that the respondent has wrongly placed reliance on earlier proceedings, which had already been set aside, and

has proceeded to reject the claim of the petitioner without conducting any fresh enquiry as directed. The learned counsel submitted that the respondent has exceeded his jurisdiction by virtually sitting in appeal over the orders passed by this Court and by disregarding binding judicial pronouncements. It is also contended that the respondent failed to consider the report of the Tahsildar dated 23.11.2024, which clearly indicated the factual possession and classification of the land, and thereby failed to take into account the relevant material while passing the order. The learned counsel argued that conduct of the respondent clearly establishes that he has not complied with the directions of this Court in true spirit and is liable to be punished under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

6. On the other hand, the learned Government Pleader for Revenue has relied upon the counter affidavit filed by the respondent and submitted that there is no willful disobedience on the part of the respondent and that the present contempt case is misconceived. It is contended that the respondent has duly complied with the directions of this Court by passing detailed orders in Proceedings No.LRW/2238, 2239, 2455/2017 dated 24.02.2026. It is further submitted that the said order was passed after examining the entire record, including the claims and objections of all concerned parties, and after affording due opportunity to them, and therefore, it cannot be said that there is non-compliance of the order of this Court. It is further submitted that the

delay in passing the order was neither intentional nor deliberate, but occurred due to administrative reasons and the complexity of the issues involved in the matter, which required detailed examination of voluminous records and multiple claims. It is contended that the respondent, being a quasi-judicial authority, was required to consider various aspects including earlier proceedings, claims of third parties, and statutory provisions under the Telangana Land Reforms Act, and therefore, some delay occurred. It is submitted that the respondent has acted bona fide and in discharge of his official duties and that there is no intention to disobey the orders of this Court. It is contended that the respondent has great respect for the orders of this Court and has taken steps to comply with the same by passing a reasoned order. Therefore, it is prayed that the contempt case may be dismissed.

7. The learned counsel for the respondent filed reply affidavit of the petitioner and submitted that the contentions raised by the respondent are untenable and are only an attempt to justify the deliberate disobedience of the orders of this Court. It is contended that so-called compliance by passing the proceedings dated 24.02.2026 is only an eyewash and does not amount to compliance in the eye of law. The learned counsel submitted that compliance of a judicial order must be real, effective and in accordance with the spirit of the directions issued by the Court, and not a mere formality. It is further contended that the respondent has completely ignored the scope of the remand ordered in

L.R.A.No.10 of 2012, which required fresh adjudication of the matter after considering the documentary evidence and affording opportunity to all parties. Instead of undertaking such exercise, the respondent has simply relied upon earlier proceedings and rejected the claim of the petitioner, thereby defeating the very purpose of the remand. It is also submitted that the respondent has failed to consider the binding findings of this Court in C.S.No.7 of 1958 and the subsequent orders of the Hon'ble Division Bench, which clearly establish the rights of the petitioner over the subject lands. The learned counsel would further submit that the respondent's order is self-contradictory and suffers from non-application of mind, inasmuch as it refers to certain proceedings having attained finality, while at the same time ignoring the fact that those very proceedings were reopened and set aside by the appellate authority. It is also contended that the respondent has failed to consider the proceedings of the Tahsildar dated 28.02.2026, which support the claim of the petitioner and recognize his rights in the subject lands. Thus it is contended that the conduct of the respondent in passing the order only after issuance of Form-I notice by this Court clearly demonstrates that the respondent acted under compulsion and not in obedience to the orders of this Court. Such conduct amounts to willful disobedience and undermines the authority of this Court. Therefore, it is prayed that the respondent may be punished under the provisions of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

8. A careful examination of the record would reveal that this Court, in W.P.No.4744 of 2025, by order dated 18.02.2025, directed the respondent herein/RDO to pass orders in C.C.I os.W/80/75 and W/92/75 strictly in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of six (06) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order, and to communicate the decision to the petitioner. Admittedly, the respondent has not complied with the said direction within the stipulated time. In the present Contempt Case, this Court *vide* orders dated 17.10.2025 and 19.11.2025 issued notice to the respondent and thereafter, the matter was adjourned several times for filing counter. On 30.01.2026, this Court observing that despite granting sufficient time the respondent has not filed counter affidavit and that the attitude of respondent is lethargic in complying the orders of this Court, issued notice in Form-I to the respondent and adjourned the case to 27.02.2026. In pursuance of the orders dated 30.01.2026 only, the respondent has filed counter affidavit on 26.02.2026 enclosing the copy of order dated 24.02.2026 in Proceedings No LRW/2238, 2239, 2455/2017.

9. The relevant paragraphs of the Proceedings No LRW/2238, 2239, 2455/2017 dated 24.02.2026 issued by the respondent are extracted below:

"ORDER:

Perused the material on record and also the objections filed in this case. During the course of enquiry before this Tribunal several claims and objections have been filed, case wise details are enumerated below. Now the following questions have raised before this Tribunal, all the questions such raised shall be answered point wise:

1. Whether the subject lands were ever part of C.S.No.7/1958 as alleged by the petitioner i.e, Nawab Mohd Yousufuddin Khan, S/o.Late Nawab Wajihuddin Khan?

The Hon'ble High Court vide its orders in Application No.488 of 2012 in Application No.519 of 2009 and Application No.24 of 2024 in C.S.No.07 of 1958, dated:09-01-2025 have categorically observed that one Smt.Sultana Jahan Begum, D/o. Late Nawab Moinuddula Bahadur has filed O.S.No.130/1 of 1953 for partition and separate possession of the Matruka Properties specifically shown in the Schedules appended to the plaint, on the file of the City Civil Court, Hyderabad, which was later transferred to the file of the High Court and numbered as C.S.No.7 of 1958.

Further the Hon'ble High Court in the same orders have also observed that the parties to the suit have filed memorandum of compromise. An application namely Application No.126 of 1958, was filed praying to record compromise and to appoint M/s.Raja Kishandas and Nawab Saleem Khan as Commissioners / Receivers with the powers set out in the memorandum of compromise. Accordingly, a preliminary decree was passed on 06-04-1959. Thereafter, the Commissioners / Receivers have affected the partition of the lands as per the schemes and filed their report dated: 20-12-1965 and affidavit dated:20-09-1966 in application No.205 of 1966.

The Hon'ble High Court went on to enumerate the distribution statement of the Commissioners/Receivers as mentioned above, Schedule A comprised of 254 items have been mentioned, the subject lands in Sy.Nos.174 to 183 & 154 of Pedda Shapur Village, Shamshabad Mandal are never shown in this statement by the Hon'ble High Court. The petitioner herein has also submitted copy of the judgment of Hon'ble High Court in Application No.125 of 1982 in C.S.No.07 of 1958, dated:16-11-1984. Claiming to be the final decree passed by the Hon'ble High Court in respect of the subject lands in Sy.Nos.173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, total admeasuring Ac.74.97 Cents situated at Pedda Shapur Village of Shamshabad Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. As already discussed, supra the Judgment of Hon'ble High Court in Application No.488 of 2012 in Application No.519 of 2009 and Application No.24 of 2024 in C.S.No.07 of 1958, dated:09-01-2025 is binding upon all, and it's highly unlikely that the subject lands of

Pedda Shapur Village are part of C.S.No.7 of 1958 as claimed by the petitioner herein.

As such all the material placed before this Tribunal by the petitioner herein appears to be concocted and fraudulent and only brought forward for the purpose of filing this present case. He is claiming title in respect of the lands through his father late Nawab Wajiuddin Khan on the strength of preliminary decree of Hon'ble High Court in Application No.104 of 1960 in C.S.No.07 of 1958 is also under dispute as there is no reference as to the present lands of late Rafiuddin in the Schedule of Properties attached to the preliminary decree referred to above, but in the report filed in Application No.335 of 1962 in C.S.No.07/1958 there is a reference about Pedda Shapur Village in Sy.Nos.171 to 183 to an extent Ac.80-00 gts which is totally irrelevant and fabricated one for the purpose of filing present petition, **which is devoid of merits and deserves no consideration.** This answers the question

2. Action on the orders of the LRAT., in 10/2012, dated:04-04-2017 filed by Nawab Mohd Yousufuddin Khan, S/o late Nawab Wajihuddin Khan?

Since the orders of the LRT., dated:27-05-1977 have been challenged several times in LRA No.2199/77, d 05-07-1978, 271/1994 & 277/1994, dated:14-03-1995 and in appeal before the Hon'ble High Court in CR.P.No.621/1979 & C.MP No. 1349 & 1350 of 1979 & CRP.No.2286/1995 & 2676/1996. The Hon'ble High Court has dismissed the revision petition by confirming the common order passed by the LRAT., passed in LRA No 271 & 277 of 1994. Thus, the order passed by the Land Reforms Tribunal have attained finality.

The LRAT.. in its judgment in 10/2012 have categorically stated that....*"The appellant has filed several documents of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. pertaining to his rights in the disputed property situated at Pedda Shapur village. **He has not filed those documents before the lower tribunal.** He has directly filed this appeal before this court as third party/aggrieved. Those documents are to be examined and decision is to be given. The petitioner who is claiming the property by virtue of the orders and decree of the Hon'ble High Court shall be given opportunity to advance his case and therefore he should be given opportunity to appear before the lower tribunal and canvas his case before the lower tribunal along with his documents. This court being appellate authority against the order of the lower tribunal and the claim of the appellant was not adjudicated by the lower court and the appellant directly approached this court it is fit case to remand the matter to the lower tribunal with direction to consider the case of the appellant by giving opportunity to the appellant and the other party and dispose of the same on merits. **The truth or otherwise of the documents filed by the appealing cannot be decided by this appellate tribunal and it is lower***

tribunal that has to record the evidence of the appellant, mark the documents and decide the case afresh for giving any exemption to the properties claimed by the appellant.

It is an undeniable fact that the then LRAT., in its judgment in W/80/75 & W/92/75, dt:15-07-1994 have held that as per original file bearing No.H/8457/65 of the then Revenue Divisional Officer, Chevella Division (This is a file wherein 38-A was granted over the subject lands in favour of the Late Protected Tenant Sri. Eshwaraiah) it is clearly mentioned that "the Patteddar Rafiuddin died and LR's in title got mutated the subject land in Sy.No.202 Old and New 172 to 183, admeasuring Ac.171-16 gts of Shapur Kalan village in their favour by the then Tahsildar mutation No.B5/6742/1965. The Tenant Eshwaraiah entered into agreement of sale for Rs.10,000/- from the LR's of Patteddar Sri. Rafeeuddin and a certificate on stamp paper of Rs.300/- was issued to the tenant, as such the tenant have accrued the rights of patteddar. Subsequently Eshwaraiah's wife Smt.Satyamma & son Jai Hind filed declaration before the LRT.,

Further as per Sec.5 of the Telangana Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1950... "A person lawfully cultivating any land belonging to another person shall be deemed to be a tenant if such land is not cultivated personally by the landholder and if such person is not, - Persons deemed to be tenants. [Act No. XXI of 1950] 9 (a) a member of the landholder's family"

As such the 38-A issued by then Revenue Divisional Officer has attained finality. Hence this Tribunal is of the opinion that the request of the petitioner to deleted the subject lands from the holdings of Smt.Satyamma & Jai Hind **deserves no consideration.** This answers the question.

3. Are the implead petitioners Mir Mohd Ali Khan, Mir Jaffar Ali Khan & Smt.Zaheerunnisa Begum eligible for any relief if so, to what extent?

As seen from the preliminary decree in O.S.No.09/1966, dated: 17-04-1970 on the file of the II Addl., Chief District Judge, City Civil Court, Hyderabad on which these implead petitioners are relying, it is evident that Late Kulsumunnisa Begum, W/o.Jabandar Ali Khan has filed the suit for declaration that the plaintiff therein is the heir of late Mir Wazeer Ali Khan Known as "Asaf Yawaral Mulk" and be declared as owner of the properties. The said O.S.No.9 of 1966 was upheld by the Hon'ble High Court in CCCA.No.81/1973 and same was also confirmed by the Apex Court in SLP.No.227/1976. As such they have perfected their title and attained finality. These implead petitioners have filed certain documents in which there are no where the properties of Pedda Shapur village are mentioned and the Civil Court order is for grave yard covered by an extent Ac.2-00 gts in which the Archaeology Dept., was made party.

Hence the implead petitioner have only perfected their claim for an extent Ac.7-26 gts in Sy.No.182 of Pedda Shapur Village of Shamshabad Mandal. The same has also been confirmed by the then Tahsildar in file No.D/480/2011, dated:30-12-2013. This answers the question.

4. Are the Respondents Chennakesha Anjaiah, S/o.C.M. Blesh & (5) Others are eligible for any relief? Are the Respondents Chennaboina Krishna Yadav, S/o.Late C.Sayanna Yadav & Jagan Mohan Reddy, S/o.Late R.Krishna Reddy are eligible for any relief?

On perusal of the documents submitted it was observed that one Chennakesha Sathaiah had purchased the lands bearing Sy.No.176 (6-00), Sy.No.177(4-30) & 178(10-31), total admeasuring Ac.21-21 gts situated at Pedda shapur Village, Shamshabad Mandal, Ranga Reddy District from recorded pattedar Mohd Rafiuddin through unregistered sale deed about 55 years back and his name was incorporated in the pahanies from 1964 in possession column. Subsequently they have filed perpetual injunction and rectification of records before the Sr.Civil Judge, R.R. District in O.S.No.350/2003 and the said suit has been decreed on 22-04-2004. Further another suit for declaration of title and perpetual injunction was filed against original pattedar in O.S.No.1294/2004 in respect of land in Sy.Nos.177 (1- 23) & 178 (3-24), total Ac.5-07 gts which was also decreed in favour of them on 22-12-2005. Yet another suit in O.S.No.1442/2004, dated:30-07-2007 has also been decreed in their favour for lands in Sy.Nos.177 (1-24) & 178(3-23).

On perusal of the documents submitted by Chennaboina Krishna Yadav, S/o.Late C.Sayanna Yadav & Jagan Mohan Reddy, S/o. Late R.Krishna Reddy it is observed that he holds agreement of sale over the subject lands in Sy.nos.182 & 183 admeasuring Ac.15-30 gts from the LRs of the original Pattedar Late Rafiuddin Khan and request to delete the said holding from the holdings of Nawab Yosufuddin Khan. Further the respondent Jagan Mohan Reddy, S/o.Late R.Krishna Reddy purchased lands in Sy.No.176(6-00) and Sy.No.182(5-00) total admeasuring Ac.11-00 gts of Pedda Shapur Village from Sri.G.Jai Hind and others through Un-Registered sale deed document dated:22-07-1989. Further the then Special Grade Deputy Collector & Revenue Divisional Officer, Chevella Division have passed orders U/s.10(4) of APLR(COAH), Act, 1973 in CC.No.W/80/75 & W/92/75, dated:28-07-2008, wherein the Tahsildar, Shamshabad Mandal was ordered to take over the possession of the subject lands to an extent Ac.167-64 Cents including lands in Sy.No.176 (6-00), Sy.No.177(4- 30) & 178(10-31), total admeasuring Ac.21-21 gts situated at Pedda shapur Village. Subsequently the Tahsildar have taken over the possession of these lands and issued FORM- X in file No.B/492/2004, dated: 13-07-2009. Hence attained finality. This order of the LR's have never been challenged till date.

Now taking into consideration the request of these persons to delete the land in Sy.No.176 (6-00), Sy.No.177(4-30) & 178(10-31), total admeasuring Ac.21-21 gts situated at Pedda shapur Village, Shamshabad Mandal from the holdings of Smt.Satyamma & Jai Hind is affected by the Sec.17 (1) of the Telangana Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973, the sale executed after the notified date i.e., 24-01-1971 is null and void. Even though the petitioner claims to filed several suits for declaration of title and injunction, all these Civil cases were against the original declarants, the Authorized Officer, Land Reforms, Ranga Reddy District nor the Land Reforms Tribunal Cum Revenue Divisional Officer were never made party to these suits hence any orders passed behind the back of official respondents in these have no bearing over this Tribunal. Hence the claims of these respondents are **hereby rejected**.

5. Whether the claims put forth by LR's ie., G.Prem Chand, S/o.late Eshwaraiah of original declarants deserves any consideration?

The claims and objections of the original declarants and their LR's were already discussed and assailed by the LRAT., & Hon'ble High Court on several occasions. The contention of the declarant i.e., that her elder daughter is also eligible for allotment of land, the declarant i.e, Smt.Sathyamma has already put forth the similar contention before the LRAT., and same as discussed by the LRAT at para No.2 in its order dated:15-07-1994. The declarant have contended that her husband has died during the year 1966 and therefore the rights that arise by virtue of the provisions of the Hindu Succession Act, in favour of his sons and the widow are to be ascertained, the LRAT., in its above order have already taken into consideration the contention of the declarant and decided that the as per the provisions of the Hindu Succession Act, 1956 the entire holdings of late Sri.G. Eashwaraiah is dividable equally among his sons and the deceased, the share that would fell to the deceased will have to be again divided equally among the widow, and the sons & daughters of the deceased. Accordingly, the LRAT., has already considered the LR's of the deceased i.e., (04) sons (02) daughters and (01) widow and only after concluded them to be holding excess land of 2.7734 SH., which has attained finality then. As such this tribunal decides that the present claims / objections filed by G.Prem Chand, S/o.late Eshwaraiah deserves no consideration. **Hence Rejected.**

In view of the above the all the questions such raised before this Tribunal have been answered. The following subject lands to an extent 2.774 SH., which were already have been declared surplus by the Land Reforms Tribunal in C.C.No.W/80/75 & W/92/75, Selected and taken over possession by the Tahsildar attained finality in the year 2009 and these orders of the Land Reforms Tribunal deserves no amendment. The Tahsildar, Shamshabad Mandal is hereby directed to protect the subject Government lands

from encroachment and initiate steps to include the schedule suit properties in Prohibitory list of 22-A.

Mandal/Village	Sy.Nos.	Wet/Dry	Extent Ac.Cents
Chowderguda Village, Shamshabad Mandal	153	Dry	11.03
	154	Dry	10.70
	155	Dry	5.38
	156	Dry	12.13
	157	Dry	6.30
	162	Dry	16.70
	159	Dry	7.15
	160	Dry	7.20
	158	Dry	6.08
		Total	82.67
Pedda Shapur Village, Shamshabad Mandal	174	Dry	7.73
	175	Dry	11.54
	176	Dry	9.91
	177	Dry	4.63
	178	Dry	10.70
	183	Dry	10.33
	182	Dry	10.68
	154	Dry	9.45
		Total	74.97
		G.Total	157.64

10. A perusal of the aforesaid proceedings dated 24.02.2026 would disclose that the respondent has not undertaken the exercise mandated under the remand order passed in L.R.A.No.10 of 2012. The appellate authority had specifically directed fresh adjudication upon affording

opportunity to all parties and on due consideration of the documentary evidence placed on record. However, the order passed by the respondent reveals that he has substantially relied upon earlier proceedings, which had already been set aside and proceeded to record findings as though such proceedings had attained finality. Such an approach is clearly impermissible and contrary to the very scope of remand. The order does not reflect any meaningful consideration of the documentary evidence placed by the petitioner nor does it disclose independent application of mind to the issues involved. On the contrary, the findings recorded are based on erroneous assumptions and misreading of binding judicial pronouncements. The respondent has also failed to appreciate the legal effect of the orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.6240 of 1978, whereby the claim of protected tenancy in favour of Eshwaraiah was set aside, thereby rendering any subsequent transactions or claims flowing therefrom unsustainable. Further, the material on record, including the proceedings in C.S.No.7 of 1958 and the reports of the Receiver-cum-Commissioner, clearly indicate that the subject lands formed part of the estate allotted to the petitioner's predecessor. The respondent, however, has brushed aside such material without assigning valid reasons and has arrived at conclusions which are not only inconsistent but also contrary to the record. Thus, the proceedings suffer from patent illegality, non-application of mind and disregard to binding directions.

11. From the above, it is evident that the respondent, though functioning as a quasi-judicial authority, has failed to act in accordance with law and has not given due effect to the binding judicial pronouncements as well as the directions issued by the appellate authority. The reasoning assigned in the impugned proceedings is not only inconsistent but also self-contradictory, inasmuch as the respondent simultaneously relies upon earlier proceedings as having attained finality, while ignoring the fact that the very same proceedings were reopened and set aside in L.R.A.No.10 of 2012. Such contradictory reasoning renders the decision unsustainable in the eye of law. The respondent is expected to adjudicate the matter afresh within the parameters of the remand order, but instead has adopted an approach which defeats the very purpose of remand.

12. It is brought to the notice of this Court that in pursuance of the directions issued in the order dated 21.01.2025 in W.P. No.1550 of 2025 and in the order dated 27.02.2026 in C.C.No.3700 of 2025, the Tahsildar, Shamshabad has issued Proceedings vide No.B/223/2025 dated 28.02.2026, wherein it was ordered as follows:

"In view of my discussion Supra the writ petitioners are the Legal heirs of Late Mohammed Wajhi Uddin khan who was defendant No.9 in C.S 7 of 1958 which was closed on 9th January 2025 by the Hon'ble High Court whereby items to 229 of Schedule A was held to be free from any encumbrances and there was a direction for passing final decree interms of the preliminary decree. And defendant No.9 was allotted Sy.Nos. 172 to 183 of Jeddashapur Village, Shamshabad Mandal as per the report of the receiver dt:7-12-1964 vide Application No.335/1962 and as per the allotment letter dt:31-12-1965 and also under Application No.125/1982

dt:16-11-1984 a panchanama conducted by Receiver-Cum-commissioner and constructive possession was given under a cover of Panchanama with Sketch Map and Demarcations and specific boundaries.

The land surrendered by Late G.Eshwaraiah of the land belonging to Third parties has no relevance and cannot be binding on the real owners of the properties without whose knowledge the proceedings underwent. As per the orders passed in L.R.A.10 of 2012 Dt:04-04-2017 in respect of Sy.Nos. 174, 175, 176, 178, 182 & 183, the surrender proceedings were set aside. And further the remaining land was not Ceiling Surplus but was claimed by some Third Parties as mentioned above whose claims have been rejected as mentioned above.

Therefore I am of the view that the writ petitioners names have to be incorporated in the Revenue Records (Bhubharati) as being the owners of the land as per the orders of the Hon'ble High Court in C.S.7/1958 vide Application No. 125/1982 dt:16-11-1984 which are the final decree proceedings containing the schedule of properties along with the Sy. Nos and Boundaries mentioned as schedule A2R and also as per the final orders passed on Dt:09-01-2025 before the Division Bench putting an end to C.S.07/1958 Litigation in respect of Item No. From 1 to 229 of the suit schedule. These properties were part of Item No.4 of schedule "A" of the suit schedule in C.S.07/1958 and thereby the said order is required to be implemented as per the directions of the Hon'ble High Court.

All the third party claims through Late G.Eshwaraiah and his legal heirs (Sathyamma and Jaihind) and various other persons claiming through them of purchase on the basis of Protected Tenancy of Late G.Eshwaraiah is found to be untenable as there are no Protected Tenants in respect of Sy.Nos.172 to 183 of Peddashapur Village, Shamshabad Mandal at any point of time and even if there are any transactions they are hit by Sec-52 of the Transfer of Property Act 1882, and they become null and void as per Law. This order is being made by this authority keeping in view of the directions of the Hon'ble High Court enunciating the rights of the parties in various proceedings and also keeping in view of the legal principle this order is passed to meet the ends of justice.

If any party is aggrieved by this order they are entitled to seek appropriate relief/ remedy in accordance with law available to them within the statutory period.

Necessary entries are made as per Bhubharati ROR Act 2025 in accordance with the Law."

13. It is pertinent to note that the Tahsildar, Shamshabad, in his proceedings dated 28.02.2026, has categorically recognized the rights of the petitioner over the subject lands, in terms of the orders passed by this Court in C.S.No.07 of 1958 vide Application No. 25 of 1982 dated 16.11.1984, and has consequently directed incorporation of the petitioner's name in the revenue records (Bhu Bhara i) in accordance with the final decree proceedings dated 09.01.2025 in C.S.No.7 of 1958 and subsequent orders of this Court. However, the respondent has taken a diametrically opposite view without assigning any cogent or tenable reasons for discarding the said proceedings. Such an approach clearly reflects non-application of mind and arbitrary exercise of quasi-judicial power.

14. Article 215 of the Constitution of India states that every High Court shall be a court of record and shall have all the powers of such a Court including the power to punish for contempt of itself. The said power is not only constitutional but also inherent, meant to ensure that the authority of this Court is upheld and its orders are obeyed in both letter and spirit. Rule 27 of the Contempt of Courts Rules, 1980 empowers this Court to pass such orders as the justice of the case requires. Thus, when a party, more particularly a public authority, fails to comply with the directions of this Court in true spirit, this Court is duty bound to exercise its jurisdiction to uphold the majesty of law. The Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Court in several canons of judgments

held that consideration means it should be in true spirit applying mind to the facts of the case. Simple rejection without applying mind does not amount to compliance of the order. Mere formal or mechanical compliance, without proper consideration, would not amount to compliance in the eye of law. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **SEBI vs. Sahara India Real Estate Corpn. Ltd.**,¹ held as follows:

“35. Sufficient opportunities have been given to the contemnors to fully comply with those orders and purge the contempt committed by them but, rather than availing of the same, they have adopted various dilatory tactics to delay the implementation of the orders of this Court. The non-compliance with the orders passed by this Court shakes the very foundation of our judicial system and undermines the rule of law, which we are bound to honour and protect. This is essential to maintain faith and confidence of the people of this country in the judiciary.”

15. In the present case, it clearly demonstrates that respondent has failed to comply with the directions issued by this Court in W.P.No.4744 of 2025 in true letter and spirit. The purported compliance by way of proceedings dated 24.02.2026 cannot be accepted as valid compliance in the eye of law, as the same is vitiated by lack of proper application of mind and is in clear deviation from the directions issued by this Court as well as the remand order of the appellate authority. The conduct of the respondent in not adhering to the time stipulated by this Court and in passing the impugned proceedings dated 24.02.2026 only after

¹ (2014) 5 SCC 429

initiation of contempt proceedings and issuance of notice in Form-I, unmistakably establishes willful and deliberate disobedience. The apology tendered by the respondent does not inspire confidence and appears to be a mere attempt to avoid the consequences of contempt. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that the respondent has committed civil contempt. Accordingly, the respondent is found guilty for violation of the order dated 18.02.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.No.4744 of 2025 and he is liable to be punished under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

16. In view of the findings recorded above and in exercise of the powers conferred under Article 215 of the Constitution of India and Rule 27 of the Contempt of Courts Rules, 1980, to meet the ends of justice and to ensure the majesty of law is upheld the Proceedings No.LRW/2238, 2239, 2455/2017 dated 24.02.2025 issued by the respondent/RDO are hereby set aside. Further, having regard to the conduct of the respondent and to ensure fair and impartial adjudication, the District Collector, Ranga Reddy District, is directed to withdraw the matter from the file of the respondent and entrust the same to another competent Revenue Divisional Officer. The concerned Officer shall reconsider the matter afresh and pass appropriate orders strictly in accordance with the orders of this Court in W.P.No.4744 of 2025 and the remand order passed in L.R.A.No.10 of 2012, within a

period of six (06) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order and communicate the decision to the petitioner.

17. In the result, the Contempt Case is allowed sentencing the respondent/contemnor to suffer imprisonment for a period of one (01) month and to pay a fine of Rs.2,000/- (Rupees Two Thousand only). In default of payment of fine, the respondent shall undergo simple imprisonment for a further period of two (02) weeks. The petitioner shall pay subsistence allowance to the respondent, as per Rules, during the period of detention of respondent in civil prison within two (02) weeks from today. The sentence of imprisonment is suspended for a period of two (02) weeks from today. After expiry of said period of two (02) weeks, the respondent shall surrender before the Registrar (Judicial-I), High Court for the State of Telangana, to undergo sentence of imprisonment as stated supra.

Miscellaneous petitions, pending if any, shall stand closed.

**SD/- N.SRIHARI
DEPUTY REGISTRAR**

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To

1. The District Collector, Ranga Reddy District.
2. Two CCs to GP FOR REVENUE, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad. [OUT]
3. One CC to SMT. JYOTHI ESWAR GOGINENI, Advocate [OPUC]
4. Two CD Copies

BA.

Jks

HIGH COURT

DATED: 16/04/2026

ORDER

CC.No.1563 of 2025



ALLOWING THE CONTEMPT CASE

(7) — JKS
16/4/26.