

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

Writ Petition No.23309 of 2015

Between:

G.Parvathamma

... Petitioner

and

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

... Respondent(s)

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 28th July, 2015.

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

- | | | |
|----------|---|---------------|
| <u>1</u> | <u>Whether Reporters of Local newspapers</u>
<u>may be allowed to see the Judgments?</u> | <u>Yes/No</u> |
| <u>2</u> | <u>Whether the copies of judgment may be</u>
<u>marked to Law Reports/Journals</u> | <u>Yes/No</u> |
| <u>3</u> | <u>Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to</u>
<u>see the fair copy of the Judgment?</u> | <u>Yes/No</u> |

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

-

WRIT PETITION No.23309 OF 2015

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed aggrieved by the order of Tahsildar,

Rajampet Mandal-3rd respondent vide Ref.No.B/253/2015, dt.15.06.2015 whereby petitioner's D-patta granted for the land admeasuring Ac.2.00 gts in Sy.No.266/8 of H.Kotha Palli Village, Rajampet Mandal, Kadapa District, was cancelled.

Petitioner states that he has preferred an appeal against said order on 14.07.2015 before the 2nd respondent along with a stay petition, but the 2nd respondent is not taking up the appeal and stay petition for hearing and apprehending dispossession pursuant to the impugned order, the present writ petition is filed.

Since the petitioner has already availed the remedy of preferring appeal before the 2nd respondent, petitioner is at liberty to pursue the interim application pending in the said appeal, requesting the 2nd respondent to pass appropriate orders.

Nothing survives in this writ petition, except directing the 2nd respondent to consider the request of the petitioner for fixing an early date of hearing of the stay petition and pass appropriate orders.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of directing the 2nd respondent to consider the request of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders in the stay petition pending in the appeal, preferably, within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Since the petitioner apprehends threat of dispossession in pursuance of impugned order of 3rd respondent, *status-quo* existing as on today shall be maintained till the 2nd respondent passes appropriate order as stated above. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending if any, shall stand dismissed.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

28th July, 2015.
gra