

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

* * *

WRIT PETITION No. 28490 of 2015

BETWEEN

Ch.Sithamma and another

... PETITIONERS

AND

The State of A.P., Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department and others

...RESPONDENTS

Date of Order pronounced: 03.09.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-
-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

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

-
-

ORDER:-

Heard.

2. Petitioner No.1, who is aged 85 years, claims that she owns land to an extent of Ac.0-3½ cents in Survey No.197 of Chowdavaram Village, Guntur Rural Mandal, Guntur District. It is further stated that her son and daughter-in-law are attempting to alienate the said land, for which they presented a document on 14.08.2015 before the fourth respondent. The document however was kept pending and not yet registered. Petitioner No.1 filed a representation before the District Collector on 17.08.2015 complaining of such action on behalf of her son and daughter-in-law and requested the Collector to take appropriate action. The present writ petition is filed alleging inaction on the part of the District Collector.

3. I am unable to see any grounds on which the District Collector can enquire into and give directions to the registering authority viz., the fourth respondent as sought for by the petitioner. The request made by the petitioners to the District Collector itself, therefore, cannot be entertained by the District Collector and consequently no orders can be passed in the present writ petition directing consideration of the said representation. However, if petitioners have any objection with regard to any document being registered by the fourth respondent, they have to approach the fourth respondent by filing appropriate objections so that the fourth respondent could look into the same and then take appropriate decision in the matter.

Hence, with the liberty aforesaid, writ petition is dismissed.

As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

September 3, 2015

LMV