

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

* * *

WRIT PETITION No. 31595 of 2015

BETWEEN

Pasala Kotaiah

.. PETITIONER

AND

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

...RESPONDENTS

Date of Order pronounced: 29.09.2015

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. Petitioner states that he is the owner of land to an extent of Ac.1-28 cents in survey No.392/1 and Ac.0-84 cents in survey No.392/2 at Kotapadu Revenue Village and that he was already issued pattadar passbook and title deed bearing passbook No.298 dated 23.12.1997 and he is stated to be

under the cultivation of the said land. It is alleged that the Mandal Revenue officer issued pattadar passbooks in favour of the fifth respondent ignoring the claim of the petitioner. Petitioner, therefore, made a complaint to the District Collector on 07.09.2015 requesting to enquire into the matter. Petitioner has filed the present writ petition aggrieved by the action of the fourth respondent in recording the name of fifth respondent in the place of the petitioner with respect to the aforesaid land in survey No.392/1 belonging to the petitioner.

3. Even assuming that petitioner's contentions are correct, petitioner has to approach the appellate authority if he is aggrieved by the wrongful entry in the revenue records by deleting the name of the fifth respondent. Petitioner cannot get any relief merely on a representation to the District Collector, as the District Collector is not the appellate authority under the A.P.Record of Rights in Land and Pattadar Passbooks Act, 1971.

Hence, with the liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate appellate 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 29, 2015
LMV