

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.25664 OF 2015

—
—

Between:

Pylla Veera Manmadha Reddy.

.. Petitioner

And

The State of Telangana and others.

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 14-08-2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V.AFZULPURKAR

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

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V.AFZULPURKAR

W.P.No.25664 of 2015

ORDER:

Heard.

The order directing mutation with regard to the land admeasuring Ac.5-3 8 gts., in Sy.No.82 situated at M.Turkapally Village, Valigonda Mandal, Nalgonda District, as ordered by the 4th respondent in Proceedings No.B/940/2015, dated 15-07-2015, is challenged by way of an appeal before the 3rd respondent. The said appeal along with the stay application was filed on 22-07-2015. However, the present writ petition is filed by the petitioner alleging that no date is given nor the appeal is taken up for hearing and meanwhile, the order of the 4th respondent is likely to be implemented in the revenue records.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that already similar request of the 5th respondent was rejected by the 4th respondent in Memo No.B/333/2014, dated 04-03-2014 and instead of preferring an appeal against that order, the 5th respondent has once again approached the 4th respondent, who has now passed the order granting mutation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that if the order of the 4th respondent, which is challenged before the 3rd respondent, is implemented, it would lead to multiplicity of proceedings, as it is necessary for the 3rd respondent to fix an early date of hearing and hear the stay petition and pass appropriate orders therein atleast.

Since the petitioner has already preferred an appeal before the 3rd

respondent, in my view, it would be appropriate to direct the 3rd respondent to take up the said appeal and fix an early date of hearing and hear the petitioner at least to the extent of stay petition and then pass appropriate orders thereon expeditiously, preferably within one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand closed.

VILAS V.AFZULPURKAR, J

Date: 14-08-2015

Prv

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V.AFZULPURKAR

W.P.No.25664 of 2015

-
14-08-2015

Prv