

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

* * * *

-

WRIT PETITION No.35867 of 2015

BETWEEN

Kommasani Nagireddy.

... PETITIONER

AND

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

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 01.12.2015

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:

Heard.

2. Petitioner states that his land was acquired and an Award No.50 of 2015 dated 21.09.2105 was already passed by the Land Acquisition Officer awarding compensation to him. However, the same is not paid to the petitioner. Hence, the present writ petition is filed by the petitioner alleging that having passed an award in his favour, there was no reason for the LAO not to pay compensation to him.

3. Learned Government Pleader for Land Acquisition was, therefore, required to get instructions on 04.11.2015. Today, when the matter is taken up, learned Government Pleader states,

on instructions, that the award, no doubt, was passed in favour of the petitioner and a compensation amount of Rs.29,48,181/- was decided in favour of the petitioner but claims were received from third party claiming the aforesaid land and it also appears that the said third party approached this Court by WP.No.33530 of 2015 seeking consideration of their application dated 05.10.2015 pending before the LAO and in view of that, it is stated that compensation amount was not paid to the petitioner.

4. The order of this Court in WP.No.33530 of 2015 dated 12.10.2015 is also placed before this Court by the learned counsel for the petitioner, which also refers to the award having

been passed in favour of the petitioner on the ground that he is the enjoyer of the land. However, third party claim having being received by the LAO, the said writ petition was disposed of directing the LAO to consider the said application in accordance with law and pass appropriate orders expeditiously.

5. It is now evident that there is claim by the petitioner in pursuance of the award in his favour and claim by third party for the said compensation amount. Hence, in my view, it would be just and appropriate to direct the third respondent to give notice to both parties, hear both parties and dispose of the objections of the third party by complying with the earlier orders of this Court, referred to above.

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

December 1, 2015

DSK