

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.25120 OF 2015

—
—

Between:

Nelavalli Vijayamma and others.

.. Petitioners

And

The State of A.P. and others.

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 11-08-2015

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.25120 of 2015

ORDER:

Heard.

Aggrieved by the order of the 3rd respondent in D.Dis.(E8)792/2015, dated 30-06-2015 cancelling their assignments, the petitioners have preferred an appeal before the 2nd respondent. The said appeal was taken up by the 2nd respondent and by order, dated 31-07-2015 while admitting the appeal rejected the stay application of the petitioners. To the extent of rejecting the stay application, the petitioners filed the present writ petition.

The order of the 3rd respondent, which is impugned in the appeal before the 2nd respondent, cancels the assignment in favour of the petitioners on the ground of breach of conditions of grant and further directs resumption of the lands in question. The 3rd respondent passed order on 30-06-2015 and a month thereafter, the 2nd respondent passed order, dated 31-07-2015. The status of the lands from the date of order of the 3rd respondent till now cannot therefore be ascertained at this stage. Hence, in my view, it would be appropriate if the status-quo existing as on today to be maintained by the petitioners as well as respondents 3 to 5 herein with regard to the lands, which are subject matter of appeal before the 2nd respondent. It is further appropriate to request the 2nd respondent to fix an early date of hearing and decide the appeal expeditiously as soon as the records are received.

Learned counsel for the petitioners, who is appearing for the petitioners before the 2nd respondent, agrees to argue the appeal on the date fixed by

the 2nd respondent.

Hence, the writ petition is disposed of directing the 2nd respondent to fix an early date of hearing of the appeal, as soon as the records are received and hear and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, after hearing all the concerned parties, with regard to lands, which are subject of appeal. Pending disposal of the appeal, status-quo existing as on today to be maintained by both the parties. No costs.

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

VILAS V.AFZULPURKAR, J

Date: 11-08-2015

Note:

Issue C.C. in three days

(B/o)

Prv

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V.AFZULPURKAR

W.P.No.25120 of 2015

-
11-08-2015

Prv