

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

* * * *

-

WRIT PETITION No.33587 of 2015

BETWEEN

Kalthireddy Seshamma.

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 04.11.2015

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

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

-

-

-

-

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed alleging that respondents 3 and 4 are attempting to lay a road without notice and without giving opportunity to the petitioner in her land in Sy.Nos.1670-A, 1670-CIP and 1161/B admeasuring Ac.0.97 cents at Epuru Bit-2, Venkatachalam Mandal, SPSR Nellore District.

2. Learned Government Pleader, who was directed to get instructions on the last date of hearing, now submits, on instructions, that one M. Karunakar Reddy and 9 others sought survey for restoration of cart track. The Mandal Surveyor and the Revenue Inspector along with the Village Revenue Officer, Epuru Bit-II visited the plan marked cart track area along with the M. Karunakar Reddy, other villagers and the son of the petitioner and information of the proposed survey was given to all the interested persons in the village. It is stated that the survey has been completed in the presence of the villagers and in the presence of the son of the petitioner and no one has raised objections at the time of survey. It is also stated that if any encroachments in the Government land are sought to be removed, appropriate steps, in accordance with law, will be taken.

3. It is evident from the above that except survey no other work was undertaken and since the said survey was conducted as per the request of the residents of the village, the allegations of the petitioner are merely based on apprehension. Hence, no further directions are called for.

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 4, 2015

DSK