

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.27287 of 2015

BETWEEN

M/s. Lumbini Majestic Welfare Association.

... PETITIONER

AND

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

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 31.08.2015

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:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader representing respondents 1 to 3 and Mr. S.R. Mahajir, learned counsel for the fourth respondent.

2. Though the fourth respondent has filed a counter affidavit together with documents and petitioner counsel has raised various contentions on merits of the matter, it is neither appropriate nor proper to deal with the merits in this writ petition inasmuch as the revision filed by the fourth respondent is pending before the first respondent. The said revision is directed against the orders of the second respondent in CCLA Proceedings No.BBB1/657/2013 dated 03.05.2014. The order impugned herein, passed by the first respondent, shows that while entertaining the revision, interim suspension of the impugned order therein was granted and the said revision is stated to be pending.

3. Petitioner herein is aggrieved by the said interim order and states that the said order is passed without hearing it and that its substantial rights are likely to be permanently affected if the fourth respondent takes up constructions on the site.

4. Keeping in view the fact that the revision petition is pending before the first respondent, in my view, it is appropriate to direct the first respondent to fix an early date for hearing of the said revision including the interim application and after notice to the parties, pass appropriate further orders either with respect to the stay petition or in the revision petition itself. Petitioner herein is at liberty to submit objections/counter to the revision petition as well as the interim application so that the first respondent would consider the matter comprehensively and pass appropriate orders, as directed above, expeditiously.

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

August 31, 2015

Note: Furnish C.C. of the order by 02.09.2015.

(**B/o**) DSK