

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

W.P.No.26587 of 2012

Between:

Syed Ghouse Mohiuddin

... Petitioner/Appellant (s)

And

The Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation
and another

... Respondent (s)

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 13.08.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. RAJASHEKER REDDY

- | | | |
|---|---|--------|
| 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 Reports/Journals | Yes/No |
| 3 | Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see
the fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

-

-

-

-

-

-

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.26587 OF 2012

ORDER

-

The case of the petitioner is that he has acquired the property admeasuring 54 sq.yards in Sy.Nos.196, 197, 228, 236, 246 and 250 situated at Hashimabad, Falaknuma Railway Bridge, Hyderabad though a absolute agreement of sale dated 22.11.2008 and has been in occupation of the same. While so, the respondent corporation proposed to widen the existing nala from 20 feet width to 80 feet and in the said process, hundreds of houses including that of the petitioner is proposed to be demolished for public purpose. It is also stated that the 2nd respondent visited the petitioner's locality and threatened the petitioner to accept the cheque for exgratia amount otherwise his house will be demolished. The petitioner under the threat accepted to receive the cheque under the impression that a reasonable amount will be given as exgratia. But the amount he received through the cheque was only Rs.808/- and further his signatures were obtained on three blank papers diverting his attention. Realising about the same, when the petitioner tried to return the cheque to the 2nd respondent, he rejected to accept the same and warned the petitioner to vacate the house within 48 hours. Aggrieved by the same, the present writ petition is filed.

Though Notice before admission was ordered on 27.08.2012, no interim order was granted.

The averments stated in the affidavit are vague and petitioner states that he has purchased the property to an extent of 54 sq.yards mentioning as many as 6 survey numbers and the petitioner has not even the house number. Further, the petitioner himself states that he has signed on some blank papers and has received the cheque. All these disputed question cannot be gone into the writ petition.

In view of the above, I do not see any merit in the writ petition. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. However, it is open for the petitioner to establish his rights in proper forum. There shall be no order

as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending if any, shall stand closed.

A.RAJASHEKER

REDDY,J

Date: 13.08.2015

dv