

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

* * *

WRIT PETITION No. 28331 of 2015

BETWEEN

Ponnuru Chinna Narasaiah

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, 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 questions the order passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer (RDO), Nellore, in proceedings No.J/2228/10 dated 10.11.2010. Petitioner states in the affidavit that after the order was passed in the lifetime of his mother and that she approached the Committee of SC, ST Community, who promised to resolve the issue, but later no action was taken. The mother of the petitioner died in January, 2015 and thereafter petitioner states that since the impugned order remain unchallenged, he is forced to approach this court by the present writ petition. One of the grounds in support of the writ petition is that the order is violative of principles of natural justice as set out in the prayer.

3. The impugned order specifically mentions that, “the individuals who are interested in the case have been given an opportunity to be heard in the present remanded case.” In view of that, it is evident that there is no failure of principles of natural justice and the reasoned order passed by the RDO cannot now be permitted to be questioned by the petitioner after lapse of five years period. The writ petition suffers from unexplained delay and laches and the discretion of the court does not deserve to be exercised in favour of the petitioner.

The 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