

(2026) 01 AP CK 1349

In the Andhra Pradesh High Court

Case No : Contempt Case No: 2657 Of 2025

Perumallapalli Sandhya

APPELLANT

Vs

Nuthalapati Padmavathi

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 31-01-2026

Acts Referred:

Contempt Of Courts Act, 1971 — Section 10, 11, 12

Citation : (2026) 01 AP CK 1349

Hon'ble Judges : Battu Devanand, J;A. Hari Haranadha Sarma, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Chukka Harika, Ramalingeswara Rao Kocharla Kota

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

A. Hari Haranadha Sarma, J

1. This contempt case is filed against the respondents for willful disobedience of the Interim Order dated 04.09.2025 passed by this Court in I. A. No.3 of 2025 in W. A. No.961 of 2025 under Sections 10 to 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act 1971.

2. The basis for alleging contempt as per the affidavit filed in support of the petition is that, in spite of status quo orders passed in I.A.No.3 of 2025 in W.A.No.961 of 2025, the respondent-District Agricultural Officer, Machilipatnam, Krishna vide memo in R.C.No.A2/05/2025 dated 11.09.2025 directing the petitioners and others to report duty at new Stations, thereby enforced the transfer orders in violation of the Orders passed by this Court. The directions of the learned Single Judge are not complied but after passing of the interim orders suspending the orders of the learned Single Judge, the question of transfers effected to trouble the petitioner. Therefore, there is Contempt.

3. The reply, in the counter filed by the respondent, is that learned Single Judge disposed of the writ petition directing for conducting of fresh counseling and transfers, thereafter orders were passed in W.A.No.960 of 2025 indicating that

there shall be interim suspension of the orders of the learned Single Judge, for a period of (4) weeks and in W.A.No.961 of 2025, the respondents were directed to maintain status quo. Both, W.A.No.960 of 2025 and 961 of 2025 are against the orders passed in W.P.No.16981 of 2025. In view of the orders of this Court in W.P.No.960 of 2025, the orders dated 11.09.2025 now questioned are passed. Justification is the work exigency, except (17) writ petitioners, and (16) respondents, all the other candidates were joined in their allotted places, there is no willful and deliberate violation and the respondent will abide the orders issued by this Hon'ble Court. The instructions in the memo are subject to further orders of the Court, in view of the Kharif season at peak stage.

4. The point that arise for consideration in this case is,

Whether there is willful disobedience of the orders of this Court and contempt on the part of the respondents?

Point:-

5. Clarification with regard to the interim orders passed in W.A.No.960 of 2025 and 961 of 2025 is as follows:-

[i] In I.A.No.2 of 2025 in W.A.No.960 of 2025, orders in W.P.No.16981 of 2025 dated 04.09.2025 of the learned Single Judge were suspended.

[ii] In W.A.No.961 of 2025 filed by the third parties, which was also directed against the W.P.No.16981 of 2025 in I.A.No.3 of 2025 status quo was ordered.

[iii] When the matter was pending before the learned Single Judge in the Writ Petition initially status quo orders were passed.

[iv] In the final orders of the Writ Petition, fresh counseling and transfers was directed in respect of Kurnool and Krishna Districts by the learned Single Judge.

[v] In I.A.No.2 of 2025 when the orders of the learned Single Judge are suspended, the direction as to effecting fresh transfers shall stand suspended. Then the question would be whether the transfers questioned in the writ petition shall be given effect. But, the said transfers are subject matter of the Writ Petition consequently covered by the Writ Appeals.

[vi] As per the orders in I.A.No.3 of 2025 in W.A.No.961 of 2025 the order of status quo will operate then the transfers questioned in Writ Petition need not be given effect.

[vii] Therefore, the suspension order in W.A.No.960 of 2025 will have effect of not to entertain the transfers in terms of the orders of the learned Single Judge and status quo ordered in W.A.No.961 of 2025, will operate as not to give effect to the transfers which were questioned in the Writ Petition.

[viii] This shall be the clarification with regard to the interim orders in I.A.No.2 of 2025 in W.A.No.960 of 2025 and in I.A.No.3 of 2025 in W.A.No.961 of 2025.

6. In view of the explanation offered by the respondent in the counter affidavit, and having regard to the submissions made across the Bar by the learned counsel for the respondent in the present Contempt Case, it appears that there is confusion in understanding the orders passed by this Court in I.A.No.2 of 2025 in W.A.No.960 of 2025 and I.A.No.3 of 2025 in W.A.No.961 of 2025. This Court does not find any willful disobedience of the said orders on the part of the respondent and there is no necessity to take any action since no contempt is found. Point framed is answered accordingly. Consequently, the Contempt Case is fit to be closed.

7. Accordingly, the Contempt Case is closed.

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending in this Contempt Case shall stand closed.