

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

* * *

WRIT PETITION No. 30987 of 2015

BETWEEN

Talari Lakshamma and another

... PETITIONERS

AND

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

...RESPONDENTS

Date of Order pronounced: 22.09.2015

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. Petitioners state that they made an application on 09.03.2015 for grant of Occupancy Rights Certificate (ORC) under the Andhra Pradesh (Telangana Area) Abolition of Inams Act, 1955 and is stated to be pending.

The sixth respondent also is stated to have made similar application. Petitioners now submit that enquiry in file No.L/5602/2015 is proposed to be conducted by the Revenue Divisional Officer (RDO), Rajendra Nagar Division only relating to application of the sixth respondent. However, no such notice and no enquiry is held in the application filed by the petitioners. It appears that both the applications i.e., one filed by the petitioners and the other by the sixth respondent relate to the land to an extent of Ac.1-15 guntas in Survey No.315 of Kukatpally Village, Balanagar Mandal. Petitioners, however, question the action of the third respondent in processing the application of the sixth respondent and in not taking any action on their application.

3. Since the processing of the application of the sixth respondent cannot be faulted by the petitioners as that application also has to be enquired into, there is no reason to entertain the writ petition. However, to the extent of petitioners' application also, which also relates to the same land, it is appropriate that the third respondent verifies petitioners' application and conducts enquiry in that application also along with the application of the sixth respondent so as to avoid conflict of orders.

Writ petition is therefore disposed of directing the third respondent to process the application of the petitioners and enquire into it along with the application of the sixth respondent in accordance with law. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

September 21, 2015
LMV