

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

* * * *

-
WRIT PETITION No.23240 of 2015

BETWEEN

Smt. Lokre Jyothi.

... PETITIONER

AND

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

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 28.07.2015

-
SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

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

-

-

-

ORDER:

The grievance of the petitioner in this writ petition relates to non-receiving and non-processing of document sought to be presented by him with respect to house bearing No.45/26-2C situated at Ward No.45, Ashok Nagar, Kalluru village, Kurnool District in Sy.No.778/A1 and 778/A2.

2. With regard to the same survey numbers, this Court has considered similar grievance in WP.No.17561 of 2010 and by order dated 26.07.2010 disposed of the writ petition.

In view of the same, following the aforesaid judgment, this writ petition is also disposed of reiterating the directions in the aforesaid writ petition, as under:

“As much as the land claimed by the petitioner is also in the survey numbers, which are subject matter of the proceedings, dated 17-08-2002 passed in Rc.No.E8/2262/2002, the respondents are directed that if the petitioner presents any documents/sale deeds for registration, the same shall be accepted and considered for registration without reference to the proceedings of the Collector and District Magistrate, dated 17-08-2002 issued in Rc.No.E8/2262/2002. However, it is made clear that such consideration shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Stamp Act and the Registration Act. If there are any reasons for objection, it is open to the respondent authorities to record such reasons and communicate the same to the petitioner.”

As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

July 28, 2015
DSK