

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

* * * *

-

WRIT PETITION No.35005 of 2015

BETWEEN

Mandala Sahadev.

... PETITIONER

AND

State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Secretariat,
Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 04.11.2015

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

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

-

-

-

-

ORDER:

Petitioner claims to be purchaser of an extent of 1,017 sq. yards in Sy.No.17, Seetarampuram Village, Karimnagar Mandal and District. It is alleged that the fourth respondent also claims to have purchased an extent of 716 sq. yards in the same survey number from the vendor's vendor of the petitioner. This writ petition is, however, filed alleging that since the land is a patta land, respondents 2 and 3 have no jurisdiction to interfere with the said property, but have been interfering at the instance of the fourth respondent.

2. Learned Government Pleader has received instructions, which state that the land in Sy.No.17 originally stood in the name of Padam Mallaiah and Padam Rajaiah as per the revenue record and petitioner's vendor is stated to have purchased an extent of Ac.2.00 guntas of land under document No.1068/1978 dated 10.04.1978 from the said Padam Mallaiah and Padam Rajaiah. Though the petitioner claims to have purchased an extent of 1,017 sq. yards, it is stated that the mutation with respect to the petitioner is not yet implemented. However, there is no controversy that the land is a patta land and it is stated now that neither the second respondent nor the third respondent is interfering with the possession of the petitioner.

3. So far as the dispute, if any, between the petitioner and the fourth respondent is concerned, the same is not the subject matter of this writ petition and it is open for the petitioner to agitate the said aspect by appropriate proceedings before the appropriate Court.

Since respondents 2 and 3 are stated to be not interfering with the land, as claimed by the petitioner, no further directions are called for.

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

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

November 4, 2015

DSK