

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

Case No.W.P. No.25348 of 2015

Between:

Bhupelli Vajramma W/o. Rajaiah
and another

... Petitioner/Appellant (s)

and

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

... Respondent (s)

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 12.08.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

-

-

- | | | |
|---|--|--------|
| 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 Reports/Journals | Yes/No |
| 3 | Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

-

WRIT PETITION No.25348 OF 2015

-

ORDER:

The petitioners question the order, dated 01.08.2015, of the Revenue Divisional Officer, Mancherial, Adilabad District- 3rd respondent on the ground that they have no notice. However, a close reading of the impugned order would show that the petitioners themselves appeared personally and in fact contended for dismissal of the appeal before the 3rd respondent.

Learned counsel for the petitioners, however, states that notice of date of hearing was served on the petitioners on the same day i.e. 01.08.2015 and as such, they could not effectively represent by engaging a counsel. It is also stated that what is recorded in paragraph-3 of the impugned order is not correct.

Since the orders of the judicial / quasi-judicial authorities are sacrosanct as to what is recorded therein, it is not possible to accept and it is not for this Court to go into the correctness or otherwise of what is actually recorded in the order of the 3rd respondent (see **A.R.ANTULAY v. R.S.NAYAK**^[1]). If the 3rd respondent has appropriate powers, it is for the petitioner to avail the remedy before the same authority or take appropriate recourse under Section 9 of the A.P. Rights in Lands and Pattadar Pass Books Act.

Subject to the liberty above, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

August 12, 2015.
KTL

[\[1\]](#) AIR 1988 SC 1531 (1)