

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.30610 of 2015

BETWEEN

Maramreddy Harish Kumar Reddy and another.

... PETITIONERS

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by Principal Secretary, Revenue (Land Acquisition) Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 02.11.2015

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 Reporters/Journals? | No |
| 3. | Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment? | No |

-
-
-
-

ORDER:

Petitioners have approached this Court in WP.No.24011 of 2015 questioning notification under Section 11 of the Central Act 30 of 2013 dated 04.05.2013. During the hearing of that writ petition on 31.08.2015, it was noticed that the objections of the petitioners are pending consideration and that the petitioners have raised additional objections regarding the Coastal Rural Zone Regulation and in that view, the writ petition was disposed of on 31.08.2015 giving liberty to the petitioners to file supplementary objections and respondents were directed to consider the said objections including supplementary objections and take appropriate decision as to whether final notification is required to be issued in terms of the Central Act 30 of 2013. Petitioners have, thereafter, filed supplementary objections on 10.09.2015. However, the present writ petition is filed by the petitioners alleging that they are likely to be dispossessed.

2. Learned Government Pleader, who was required to get instructions, submits today, on the basis of instructions, that the objections of the petitioners are under examination. It is also stated that only after examination of the said objections further steps in accordance with the Central Act 30 of 2013 will be taken and as such, it is merely an apprehension of the petitioners that they are being dispossessed by the respondents.

3. It is evident from the above that the objections of the petitioners are under consideration and even final notification is yet to be issued and only thereafter further steps as to award enquiry will take place and as such, taking possession of the land would arise only on completion of the proceedings in terms of the Central Act 30 of 2013. Hence, as it appears on today, this writ petition is filed merely on an apprehension, which has absolutely no 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 2, 2015
DSK