

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.23903 OF 2015

—

—
Between:

Karanam Purushottam Rao

.. Petitioner

And

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep., by its
Principal Secretary, Revenue Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 04.08.2015

—
SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the 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 |

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION No.23903 OF 2015

ORDER:

Heard.

The petitioner claims to be the owner of the land admeasuring Acs.18.46 cents in Survey No.213 of Bucharla Village, Roddam Mandal of Anantapur District. He states that the Tahsildar, Roddam Mandal, Anantapur District, the

3rd respondent, has issued a certificate, dated 03.03.2015, to the effect that the said land is a patta land and based on that he made an application to the Sub-Registrar, Penukonda, Anantapur District, the 4th respondent, to furnish the market value of the subject land. However, the 4th respondent declined to furnish the market value of the subject land, as it was included in the list of prohibited lands and insisted to obtain 'No Objection Certificate' from the revenue authorities. Questioning the said action, the present Writ Petition is filed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the subject land is private patta land and its inclusion in the prohibited category is clearly unsustainable.

The petitioner neither made any appropriate representation to the District Collector, Anantapur District, the 2nd respondent, seeking

release of the subject land from the prohibited list, nor sought the NOC. As long as the said land continues in the prohibited category, respondents 4 and 5 can neither register the document nor furnish market value certificate to the petitioner.

Hence, the Writ Petition is disposed of giving liberty to the petitioner to approach the 2nd respondent for appropriate relief and as and when the petitioner makes appropriate application, the 2nd respondent shall consider the same expeditiously and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Writ Petition shall stand closed.

VILAS V.AFZULPURKAR, J

04.08.2015

KH