

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

**WRIT PETITION Nos. 11679 & 11686 of 2011**

Between:

**Katta Sandhya**

**.. Petitioner in W.P. No.11679 of 2011**

**Y. Anjaiah Suguna Kumari**

**.. Petitioner in W.P. No.11686 of 2011**

and

The District Collector, Ranga Reddy  
And others

**.. Respondents**

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 31.07.2015

**SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:**

-

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C. PRAVEEN KUMAR**

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

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C. PRAVEEN KUMAR**

**WRIT PETITION Nos. 11679 & 11686 of 2011**

**COMMON ORDER:-**

Both the writ petitions came to be filed seeking issuance of writ of mandamus declaring the action of the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent in interfering with the possession of the petitioners over plot No.69 admeasuring 200 sq. yards in survey No.283/44 and plot No.133 admeasuring 200 sq. yards in survey No.283/65 respectively, situated at Abdullahpur Village, Hayathnagar Mandal, Rangareddy District, as illegal and arbitrary.

At the time when the matters are taken up for admission, the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned Government Pleader for Assignment appearing for the respondents submitted that the subject matter of these writ petitions is squarely covered by an order dated 05.10.2012 passed by this Court in W.P.No.18986 of 2010 and batch. The operative portion of the said order is as under:

*"I have given my anxious consideration to the contentions advanced by the learned Counsel appearing for the parties. According to the respondent, land came to be resumed on 25-2-2006. As per the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Rules, 1977, notice in Form No.I is required to be given to the persons in possession of the assigned land. Admittedly, the writ petitioners are the purchasers of various plots under registered documents. No effort has been made by the 3rd respondent to put the petitioners on notice who purchased the land under registered documents. Therefore the order resuming the land, which is in occupation of the writ petitioners, is in violation of principles of natural justice and also in violation of provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Rules, 1977.*

*Accordingly, the Writ Petitions are allowed directing the respondents not to interfere with the plots in occupation of the*

*writ petitioners till the fresh resumption orders to the extent of the writ petitioners are passed after putting them on notice under the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Rules, 1977. No order as to costs."*

Accordingly, both the Writ Petitions are allowed by directing the respondents not to interfere with the plots in occupation of the petitioners, till fresh resumption orders with regard to the plots of the petitioners are passed, after putting them on notice under the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Rules, 1977. There shall be no order as to costs.

Consequently, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the writ petitions shall also stand closed.

---

**C. PRAVEEN KUMAR, J**

31<sup>st</sup> July, 2015  
cbs

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C. PRAVEEN KUMAR

WRIT PETITION Nos. 11679 & 11686 of 2011

31<sup>st</sup> July, 2015

cbs