

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

* * * *

-
WRIT PETITION No.25097 of 2015

BETWEEN

Smt. G. Rajamani.

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Telangana, Rep. by Principal Secretary, Municipal Administration & Urban Development Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad and two 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:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Pasham Krishna Reddy, learned standing counsel for respondents 2 and 3.

2. Petitioner states that she is owner of house property bearing No.17-9-79/1 and an extent of 82.82 sq. yards was acquired by the respondents 2 and 3 under award proceedings No.A/1052/2008 dated 13.10.2009. Petitioner states that she has submitted an application seeking reference on 25.09.2010, which was acknowledged by the third respondent, but, thereafter, no orders were passed.

Petitioner states that since she has received compensation under protest, she sought reference under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act under the aforesaid application claiming compensation of Rs.50,000/- per sq. yard. Since no action is taken on that application, petitioner has filed one more application dated 25.04.2014, which was again acknowledged by the third respondent, but since no orders are passed, the present writ petition is filed.

3. Learned standing counsel, who had taken time to get instructions, is unable to get instructions except stating that the petitioner constructed an extra floor and hence, not entitled for compensation.

4. As stated above, since both the applications of the petitioner, referred to above, are acknowledged by the third respondent, it is the duty of the third respondent to have examined the said applications as to whether they are filed within time and whether petitioner is entitled to seek reference on the facts and circumstances and pass appropriate orders. Since it is apparent that no orders are passed on the said applications, the third respondent is directed to consider the said applications and pass appropriate orders thereon, preferably, within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt

of a copy of this order.

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