

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH

* * *

WRIT PETITION No. 33500 of 2015

BETWEEN

T.Srikanth Reddy

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Telangana, rep. by its Principal Secretary and others

...RESPONDENTS

Date of Order pronounced: 12.10.2015

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers Yes/No

may be allowed to see the Judgments?

2. Whether the copies of judgment may be Yes/No

marked to Law Reporters/Journals?

3. Whether his Lordship wish to see the Yes/No

fair copy of the Judgment?

-

-

ORDER:-

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned government pleader for Revenue.

2. Petitioner questions the order of the Revenue Divisional Officer (RDO) in Rc.No.1/1966/2015 dated 10.09.2015 which was passed on the application of the fifth respondent. The RDO considered the said request and has ultimately directed the Tahsildar, Ranghunathpalli to enquire with the Field Assistant regarding the cultivation of the lands, in question, for the year 2015-16 and enter the name of present enjoyer in the pahanies. Petitioner questions said order on the ground that he had no notice of enquiry or any proceedings before the RDO and that his name is likely to be deleted by virtue of the aforesaid order.

3. Learned government pleader submits that the RDO has merely directed the Tahsildar to conduct an enquiry and basing on the result of the enquiry to enter the name.

4. However, the said aspect is not clear from a reading of the order as though the RDO directed the Tahsildar to conduct enquiry, the same has to be understood as the direction to enter the name only after due enquiry. Hence, while implementing the said order of the RDO, the Tahsildar, Raghunathpally, who is required to conduct enquiry, shall give notice to the petitioner as well as the fifth respondent after considering the respective cases of the petitioner and the fifth respondent, and to take appropriate decision regarding entries in the revenue record. Since the impugned order merely directs the Tahsildar to conduct enquiry, interference with the said order is not called for.

Writ petition is accordingly disposed of. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

October 12, 2015

LMV