

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

* * * *

-

WRIT PETITION No.36071 of 2015

BETWEEN

Padmasri Picture Palace.

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Irrigation Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 09.11.2015

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:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
Mr. N. Venakteshwarulu, learned standing counsel for the fifth respondent.

2. Thought the relief sought for is against all the respondents, the actions, questioned, are, primarily, that of the fifth respondent in demolishing the compound wall of the property of the petitioner in question.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a compound wall erected in the property of the petitioner was demolished in the month of September 2014 and thought the petitioner protested on 29.10.2014, no action was taken. Learned counsel further submits that after the demolition, the petitioner has constructed a new compound wall in January 2015 and apprehending that the earlier action would be initiated, the present writ petition is filed.

4. Learned standing counsel for the fifth respondent, however, submits that the petitioner's earlier compound wall was demolished as it was found to have encroached road margin and subsequently,
the compound wall is erected within the premises of the petitioner. Learned standing counsel, further submits, as on today, there is no proposal with the fifth respondent to take any action against the petitioner's property, as it is constructed within the property of the petitioner.

5. In view of the said categorical statement on behalf of the fifth respondent, the apprehension expressed by the petitioner in this writ petition is found to be without any basis. Hence, 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 9, 2015

DSK