

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

\* \* \*

**WRIT PETITION No. 23446 of 2015**

**BETWEEN**

G.Mallesappa and another

**... PETITIONERS**

**AND**

The District Collector, Anantapuram District and others

**...RESPONDENTS**

Date of Order pronounced: 29.07.2015

**SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:**

-  
-

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR**

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

-  
-

**ORDER:-**

Heard.

2. Petitioner had already approached this court in W.P.No.18887 of 2008, which was disposed on 17.06.2014 giving liberty to the petitioner to prefer an appeal before the District Collector and this court also directed that *status quo* granted on 01.09.2008 to be maintained for a period of three months and thereafter left it for the petitioner to obtain appropriate orders from the first respondent, District Collector. Apparently, petitioners have moved the appeal but did not seek appropriate interim orders pending the appeal and present writ petition is now filed alleging that pending the said appeal a fresh allotment is being made and constructions are allowed to be taken up in the rasta poramboke land. The appeal preferred by the petitioner is stated to be pending before the first respondent in Rc.No.E4-7460/14 wherein he has already admitted the appeal and called for the records and remarks and issued notice to the private party respondents on 15.11.2014.

3. In terms of the directions of this court, referred to above, *status quo* order was directed to be maintained by this court only for three months from the date of the order i.e. up to 16.09.2014 and thereafter it was for the petitioner to seek appropriate interim orders from the first respondent. However, apparently he has not obtained any such orders and now seeks *status quo* to be maintained.

4. Since this court left it for the first respondent to consider the matter and the appeal is already pending before the first respondent from November, 2014, I am not inclined to pass an interim order but the first respondent is directed to hear all the parties and decide the said appeal expeditiously within four weeks of date of receipt of a copy of this order and take appropriate consequential action.

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

July 29, 2015  
**LMV**

---

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J