

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

* * *

WRIT PETITION No. 32153 of 2015

BETWEEN

K.Navendra Babu and others

... PETITIONERS

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Principal Secretary and others

...RESPONDENTS

Date of Order pronounced: 01.10.2015

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers Yes/No

may be allowed to see the Judgments?

2. Whether the copies of judgment may be Yes/No

marked to Law Reporters/Journals?

3. Whether his Lordship wish to see the Yes/No

fair copy of the Judgment?

-

-

ORDER:-

Heard.

2. Petitioners complain that they were given a notice alleging violation of Rule 3(2) of the A.P. Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Act, 1977 and the Rules framed thereunder. It is stated that all the petitioners have given appropriate reply/objections to the third respondent and so far no orders are passed. However, alleging that the third respondent is likely to dispossess the petitioners ignoring the objections filed by them, the present writ petition is filed.

Reliance is placed upon order of this court in W.P.No.25769 of 2015 dated 14.08.2015 wherein similar grievance of neighbours of the petitioners was considered and disposed of.

3. It is further stated that though there are eight petitioners, notices are given only to petitioner Nos.1 to 4 and, as on today, no notices are stated to have been given to petitioner Nos.5 to 8. Hence, as and when they are given notices, they may file their appropriate objections. So far as petitioner Nos.1 to 4 are concerned, they shall be entitled to similar directions, as in the case aforesaid.

4. In view of above, as petitioner Nos.1 to 4 have already submitted objections to the notice, the third respondent is directed to consider the said objections and pass a reasoned order. Pending consideration of reply of petitioner Nos.1 to 4, as above, the third respondent shall not dispossess or otherwise interfere with the possession of the petitioner Nos.1 to 4.

With the above direction, 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

October 1, 2015

LMV