

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION No.9660 of 2015

BETWEEN

Rachamadugu Babu and others.

... PETITIONER

AND

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

...RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioners: SMT. A. VARALAKSHMI

**Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR ROADS & BUILDINGS
GP FOR REVENUE**

The Court made the following:

-
-
-

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Government Pleader for Roads and Buildings.

2. Petitioners claim to be owners of various houses bearing D.Nos.4-167, 2-44, 4-263/1, 2-59, 4-143, 4-149, 4-148, 4-150, Assessment No.1292, D.No.263 and 4-147, as mentioned in the prayer, situated at Pamur Village & Mandal, Prakasam District.

The cause of action for filing this writ petition appears to be a news item published in a Telugu daily, giving source as Roads and Buildings officials, that the buildings beside the road in Pamur village shall be demolished for making the road with 80 ft from the existing 30 ft road.

3. Though no instructions have been received by the learned Government Pleader in this matter, it is stated that this writ petition is similar to WP.Nos.8427 and 9422 of 2015 disposed of today,

wherein instructions have been received from the Executive Engineer, R&B Division, Kanigiri dated 06.04.2015 and the said instructions hold good in this matter also that if at all the department intends to demolish the house of the petitioners, necessary procedure of law will be followed and then only the demolition process will start.

4. In view of the said specific instructions that there is no attempt on the part of the respondents to demolish the house of the petitioners, there is no subsisting cause of action for maintaining the writ petition.

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

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

April 7, 2015

DSK