

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

-

W.P.No. 23350 of 2015

Between:

M/s. Nanda Cotton Ginning Industries and others

... Petitioner/s

and

The State of Andhra Pradesh and others

... Respondent/s

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 12 .8.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

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

-

-

-

-

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

-

W.P. NO. 23350 of 2015

-

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioners' land is said to be affected in the proposed widening of existing Proddutur Municipality Korrapadu road to 100 feet and the petitioners were given a notice dated 2.4.2015 giving them two options and requiring them to avail any one of the options. The petitioners gave their reply dated 16.4.2015 informing the Commissioner, Proddutur Municipality that they were not accepting either of the two options as proposed in the notice and opposed the acquisition of their land as it would affect their ingress and egress. The present writ petition is thereafter filed questioning the action of the respondents in seeking to acquire the petitioners' land notwithstanding the fact that they refused to avail both the options.

Learned standing counsel for third respondent who has already taken notice submits that the acquisition of petitioners' land is essential for public purpose and that the third respondent would follow the provisions of the Central Act 30/2013, if the petitioners are not agreeable to any of the two options already proposed in the impugned notice.

In view of that, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondents 2 to 4 to follow due process of law, if the petitioners' land is required to be acquired for public purpose and accordingly pay appropriate compensation to the petitioners. Miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. No order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

Dt.12.8.2015

KR