

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.24610 of 2015

BETWEEN

Veesam Satyavamma and another.

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of A.P., 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:

The grievance of the petitioners in this writ petition is non-compliance of the directions of this Court in CRP.No.3206 of 1998 dated 01.08.2007. The operative direction given by this Court is as follows:

“... In view of the same, necessarily the lands bearing S.Nos.277/2C, 267, 271/B, 121, 173, 266/B1, 266/C2, 15102, 147, 145-1, 82/1, 145-3, 153, 94/1, 218, 55, 70 situated in various villages have to be treated only as dry lands but not double crop wet lands.

The Civil Revision Petition is accordingly allowed and the matter is remitted to the primary Tribunal to treat the above lands stated in the survey Numbers as dry lands and after such classification, holding of excess land of the petitioners to be decided. No costs.”

2. Petitioners submit that in spite of the said order, no proceedings are taken up by the third respondent for implementing the said order.
3. When this writ petition came up initially, learned Government Pleader was required to get instructions. Learned Government Pleader now submits on the basis of instructions received from the third respondent that the copy of the order in CRP.No.3206 of 1988 was not received and through internet the order was examined and based on that, the exercise, as directed by this Court, is completed as per draft order and the matter is now awaiting filing orders of the RDO.
4. It is evident that while implementing the orders aforesaid, the RDO has not fixed any date of hearing nor has heard the petitioners and even if he has completed any preliminary exercise, hearing of the petitioners before passing appropriate orders is necessary.

Hence, the writ petition is disposed of directing the third respondent to fix an early date for hearing, hear the petitioners and other parties affected and then, pass appropriate orders duly implementing the orders of this Court

referred to above.

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