

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

-

W.P.No. 28725 of 2015

Between:

Billa Venkatramulu

... Petitioner/s

and

State of Telangana and others

-

... Respondent/s

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 14.9.2015

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

- | | | |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | <u>Whether Reporters of Local newspapers may be allowed to see the Judgments?</u> | No |
| - | | |
| 2 | <u>Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reports/Journals</u> | No |
| - | | |
| 3 | <u>Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment?</u> | No |

-

-

-

-
-
-
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

-
-
W.P. NO. 28725 of 2015

-
ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner is aggrieved by the notice issued by the 2nd respondent-District Registrar, Karimnagar district dated 15.7.2015 calling for information from the petitioner relating to document No. 393/2007. The petitioner states that he submitted a detailed explanation on 4.6.2015 and it is pending with the 2nd respondent. Again the 2nd respondent issued another notice dated 15.7.2015 requesting the petitioner to inform whether he is willing to compound the offence. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that he attended the hearing before the 2nd respondent on 29.7.2015 and the petitioner is unable to give consent for compounding the offence in view of the pendency of civil litigation. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner states that since the petitioner has already filed an explanation to the earlier notice, the 2nd

respondent may be directed to consider the same and pass appropriate orders.

Evidently, the 2nd respondent is seized of the explanation of the petitioner, referred to above and since the petitioner is unable to give consent for compounding the offence, the 2nd respondent is required to examine the explanation of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law after hearing the petitioner. Since the present impugned notice is only with regard to giving option to the petitioner for compounding the offence and the petitioner is not able to give any consent thereto, no interference in the said notice is called for.

Hence the writ petition is disposed of directing the 2nd respondent to consider the petitioner's explanation and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law after hearing the petitioner. Miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. No order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

Dt. 14.9.2015
KR

