

**FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF
ANDHRA PRADESH**

**FRIDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF JANUARY TWO
THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN**

Present

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1098 of 2014

Neeli Maddileti, S/o. Neeli Maddaiah,
Hindu, Aged about years,
R/o. Mettupalli Village, Owk Mandal,
Kurnool District & another

.. Petitioners

AND

Sri G. Narasimhulu,
Revenue Divisional Officer,
Nandyal, Kurnool District.

.. Respondent

The Court made the following:

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

CONTEMPT CASE No.1098 of 2014

-

ORDER:

W.P.No.31000 of 2013 was disposed of by this Court on 24.03.2014 directing the Revenue Divisional Officer, Nandyal, Kurnool District, who was the third respondent in the writ petition, to take a decision on the proposals submitted by the Tahsildar, Banaganapalle, in his letter vide Rc.B.223/13, dated 15.03.2013, with reference to the status of the land in Survey No.389/1 of Pathapadu Village, Banaganapalle Mandal, and communicate the same to the Sub-Registrar, Banaganapalle.

2. In response to the notice issued, the respondents filed counter affidavit. It is averred in the counter affidavit that since the Revenue Divisional Officer is not competent to issue No Objection Certificate as recommended by the Tahsildar, Banaganapalle, the proposals were submitted to the District Collector and the District Collector in turn agreed with the proposals submitted, expressed no objection for carrying out Deeds of Conveyance and for deletion of the property from the list of prohibited properties. Since the list was already communicated to the registering authorities, the District Collector addressed a letter bearing Rc.E2/2167/2013, dated 20.08.2014, to the Commissioner and Inspector General of Registration and

Stamps, Hyderabad, requesting the Commissioner to instruct the District Registrar, Kurnool, and the Sub-Registrar, Banaganapalle, to take action for de-notification of the land in Survey No.389/1 to an extent of Ac. 8.35 cents of Pathapadu Village of Banaganapalle Mandal, from the list of prohibited properties and to allow registrations.

3. In view of the same, there is no violation of the orders issued by this Court in W.P.No.31000 of 2013 on 24.03.2014. Hence, there is no contempt.

4. The Contempt Case is, accordingly, closed. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this contempt case shall stand closed.

P.NAVEEN RAO,

J

Date: 23rd January, 2015

KL



CONTEMPT CASE No.1098 of 2014

Date: 23rd January, 2015

KL