

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.19705 OF 2015

-
-

Between:

Smt. Ramuni Sunitha

.. Petitioner

And

The State of Telangana, rep., by its
Principal Secretary Cooperative Societies
Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad and others

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 13.08.2015

-
SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgment? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals | Yes/No |
| 3. Whether Their Lordship wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO

-

WRIT PETITION No.19705 of 2015

ORDER:

The petitioner states that she and her husband are having rice mill business and other businesses in Wanaparthi Town, Mahabubnagar District. The 3rd respondent offered its godown for lease purposes and the petitioner and her husband took the premises on lease and executed a registered lease deed, dated 07.08.2014. After execution of the lease deed, the vacant possession of the godown was handed over to the petitioner on 22.08.2014. The lease is for a period of 20 years commencing from 07.08.2014 to 06.08.2034. It appears that there were civil disputes between the petitioner and the 4th respondent. Now, the case of the petitioner is that at the instance of the 4th respondent, the 3rd respondent issued a letter, dated 06.03.2015, addressed to the Sub-Registrar of Assurances, Wanaparthi, for cancellation of the lease deed. Challenging the same, the present Writ Petition is filed.

When the Writ Petition came up for admission on 01.07.2015, this Court ordered notice before admission. Pursuant to which, the 3rd respondent appeared before this Court.

Learned counsel for the 3rd respondent submits that on the basis of mere letter of the 3rd respondent, the Sub-Registrar of Assurances, Wanaparthi, cannot take action and he has to follow due procedure of law for cancellation of the lease deed. In view of the submission made by the learned counsel for the 3rd respondent, this Court feels that the Writ Petition is filed only on

mere apprehension.

Hence, recording the submission of the learned counsel for the 3rd respondent, the Writ Petition is closed. However, it is needless to observe that the Sub-Registrar of Assurances, Wanaparthi, if he wants to take any action pursuant to the letter dated 06.03.2015 of the 3rd respondent, shall follow due procedure of law. There shall be no order as to costs.

The miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J

Date:13.08.2015

KH