

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.27631 of 2015

BETWEEN

Dr. Venkata Rama Raju Datla.

... PETITIONERS

AND

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

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 02.09.2015

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 question the notification issued by the second respondent under Section 11(1) of the Central Act 30 of 2013 bearing Rc.No.G/2243/2014 dated 23.07.2015 and Rc.No.A4/12/2015 dated 24.07.2015.

2. Petitioners claim that they are owners of an extent of Ac.29.29 guntas of land in Sy.No.853/63 of Ramanujavaram village, Manuguru Mandal, Khammam District and that it is a private patta land. Before filing the writ petition, the first petitioner himself filed a representation before the Collector dated 12.08.2015 wherein he accepts that he is aware of the Gazette notification issued, as above and that the lands of the petitioners are not included in the said notification.

3. Learned Government Pleader also states that the lands claimed by the petitioners are not notified in the Gazette impugned.

4. In view of that situation, therefore, I am of the view that there is no reason to permit the petitioner to challenge the notification as his land is not covered by the said notification, admittedly. Even then, learned counsel for the petitioners states that treating the land of the petitioners as Government land, the respondents are likely to proceed against the lands of the petitioners.

5. The said assumption of the learned counsel for the petitioners has, apparently, no basis and even otherwise, under Section 15 of the Central Act 30 of 2013, any person interested is entitled to file objections before the competent authority. The said provision, no doubt, refers to a person interested in any land, which has been notified, and the petitioners may not fall in such category as their lands are not notified. However, if the petitioners apprehend that their lands are likely to be

proceeded against, they may file objections so that the competent authority would look into the same and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

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

September 2, 2015
DSK