

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

* * * *

-
WRIT PETITION No.27083 of 2015

BETWEEN

Pilli Anjaneyulu Yadav.

... PETITIONER

AND

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

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 27.08.2015

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:

Petitioner states that he has already obtained a decree in O.S.No.551 of 1993 on the file of the I Additional Senior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy district and the said decree has already been executed by the executing Court and a sale deed in his favour was already executed. In addition to that, the suit O.S.No.220 of 2008 filed by the petitioner before I Additional Junior Civil Judge, Ranga Reddy was dismissed against which the appeal A.S.No.210 of 2008 before the III Additional District Judge (Fast Track Court), Ranga Reddy, preferred by the petitioner was allowed granting permanent injunction and restraining the defendants from interfering with the possession and enjoyment of the petitioner until the petitioner is vacated by due process of law.

2. While so, it is stated that the Tahsildar filed a complaint against the petitioner on which a case in Cr.No.209 of 2015 was registered on 17.03.2015 by the Station House Officer, P.S. Malkajgiri and against that, the petitioner filed CrIP.No.2896 of 2015 before this Court, for quashing of the complaint, wherein by order dated 30.04.2015 notice is issued and the matter is *subjudice*. Stating all these facts, the petitioner filed a representation dated 05.08.2015 before the District Collector, Ranga Reddy District seeking the following relief:

“Therefore basing on the facts and circumstances as state above I pray your kind authority not to instigate any proceeding against me with regard to dispossession or any criminal nature of proceedings against me by directing the Tahsildar, Malkajgiri Mandal, Rangareddy District, for which I will be most grateful to your kind authority.”

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader.

4. I am unable to appreciate or follow the representation of the petitioner, particularly, the relief, which he seeks, as extracted above. Evidently, there

is a decree against the defendants, referred to above and except following due process of law, the defendants are restrained from interfering with the petitioner's possession and so far as criminal proceedings are concerned, they are already stated to be *subjudice*. Since there is hardly any other action that can be taken by the respondents except initiating due process of law, I do not see any other manner in which the respondents are expected to act. Hence, the relief for consideration of the representation itself being vague and incomprehensive, no direction as sought for can be granted.

As on today, it is stated that no proceedings are initiated against the petitioner and as and when any proceedings are initiated, the petitioner is at liberty to defend himself in accordance with law.

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 27, 2015
DSK