

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE No.487 of 2015

-
18.09.2015

Between:

Y.Ganesh and others

...Petitioners

And

Mr.Devaraju, Assistant Director,
Survey and Land Records, Ranga Reddy District,
Hyderabad.

...Respondent

Counsel for the petitioners: Mr.M.V.Venu,
Mr.M.V.Hanumantha Rao

Counsel for the respondent: Assistant Government
Pleader

for Revenue (TS)

The Court made the following:

-

ORDER:

This contempt case is filed alleging willful disobedience of the order, dated 25.11.2013 in W.P.No.33662 of 2013.

By the abovementioned order, this Court directed the respondent to address the grievance of the petitioners pertaining to conduct of survey and demarcation of the boundaries in respect of lands admeasuring Acs.7.30 guntas in survey No.1016, Acs.11.13 guntas in survey No.1017 and Acs.11.05 guntas in survey No.1018 of Upperpally Village, Shameerpet Mandal, Rang Reddy District.

The respondent has filed a counter-affidavit, wherein he has, *inter alia*, stated that in compliance with the order of this Court, the file was allotted to the Inspector of Survey to conduct survey and submit a detailed report; that after issue of notices on 10.02.2014, 01.03.2014, 24.03.2014, the Inspector of Survey conducted spot inspection, verified the technical records and submitted his report on 10.07.2015, and that after receipt of the said report, the respondent issued a memo, *vide* Lr.No.A4/459/2015, dated 10.07.2015, a copy of which has been enclosed to the counter-affidavit. A perusal of the said memo shows that the Inspector of Survey and Deputy Inspector of Survey, Malkajgiri Division, conducted demarcation and submitted their report and that the correction case pertaining to survey Nos.1016 and 1018 of Upperpally Village filed under Section 87 of the Andhra Pradesh (Telangana Area) Land Revenue Act, 1317 Fasli is in the process of hearing before the Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District.

In the light of the above averments of the respondent, supported

by memo, dated 10.07.2015, I am satisfied that the respondent has complied with the order of this Court.

Hence, the Contempt Case is closed, however, with liberty to the petitioners to avail appropriate remedies in pursuance of the survey report.

(C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J)

18th September, 2015
GHN