

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

* * *

WRIT PETITION No. 31796 of 2015

BETWEEN

Puli Dayanandam and another

.. PETITIONER

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Principal Secretary and others

...RESPONDENTS

Date of Order pronounced: 30.09.2015

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers Yes/No

may be allowed to see the Judgments?

2. Whether the copies of judgment may be Yes/No

marked to Law Reporters/Journals?

3. Whether his Lordship wish to see the Yes/No

fair copy of the Judgment?

-

-

ORDER:-

Heard.

2. Petitioners' grievance is that their father was the original assignee since 1921 and that their names are continued in the revenue records. But, however, they came to know that the sixth respondent got his name inserted and obtained pattadar passbook and title deed and he is likely to make a claim with regard to the said assigned land to the extent of Ac.1-68 cents in Survey No.277/3 of Venkatapalem Village, which rightfully belongs to the father of the petitioners and succeeded by the petitioners. Petitioners are stated to have given a legal notice to the competent authority under the CRDA Land Pooling of Venkatapalem Village, Guntur District on 09.05.2015. The present writ petition is filed apprehending that the sixth respondent would be paid the compensation and would be issued a certificate. Petitioners, therefore, have approached this court claiming that they are the original owners as their father was the assignee and the sixth respondent is not entitled.

3. After examining the record and after hearing learned counsel for the petitioners, it is evident that petitioners have not yet approached the recording authority under the A.P. Rights in Land and Pattadar Passbooks Act, 1971 (for short, "the Act") and they have not agitated their claim over the land as against the sixth respondent before the competent authority. However, if the petitioners seek amendment of the revenue record by showing their names in the place of the sixth respondent they could have approached the appropriate authority under the Act and the present writ petition cannot be considered without the petitioner approaching such authority.

Hence, with the liberty to approach the appropriate authority, 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 30, 2015

Note:-

Furnish copy by two days.

{B/o} LMV