

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

* * * *

-
WRIT PETITION No.24938 of 2015

BETWEEN

T. Laxma Reddy.

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Secretariat and another.

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 24.08.2015

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

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

-
-
-
-
-

ORDER:

The grievance of the petitioner is that in spite of filing of complaint as early as in July 2014 no action is taken by the third respondent against the fourth respondent, who is stated to have dug three bore-wells unauthorizedly in the neighbouring land to the petitioner in Sy.No.413 of Keshampet Village and Mandal, Mahabubnagar District.

2. Instructions received by the learned Government Pleader state that the third respondent is conducting field inspection and has already issued notice dated 03.08.2015 to the fourth respondent herein calling for his explanation. It is also stated that the petitioner also appears to have dug a bore well in Sy.No.416 but since five years no agricultural operations are taken up and the land is kept fallow. It is also stated that on the basis of field inspection appropriate action in terms of Section 15 of the A.P. Water, Land and Trees Act, 2002 will be taken up by the third respondent by considering the representation of the petitioner. It appears that pursuant to the letter of the third respondent dated 03.08.2015, the Deputy Director, Ground Water Department addressed a letter dated 14.08.2015 to the third respondent giving necessary information, which is also appended to the instructions.

3. In view of the action already initiated by the third respondent, no further directions are necessary to be issued in this writ petition. However, the third respondent shall take appropriate necessary steps, in accordance with law, against any person, who is found to have violated the provisions of the Act.

The writ petition is disposed of. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

August 24, 2015
DSK