

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

—

—

—
WRIT PETITION No.24852 of 2015

Between:

Smt K.Mahalakshmi

...

Petitioner

and

The State of Andhra Pradesh rep.by
its Principal Secretary Stamps and Registration
Department and others.

... Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: **14.08.2015**

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 Reporters/Journals? | Yes/No |
| 3. Whether his Lordship wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

—

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V.AFZULPURKAR

-
WRIT PETITION No.24852 of 2015

-
ORDER:

Heard.

2. Petitioner is stated to have executed a sale deed in favour of respondents 4 to 7 and the said document is pending viz., P.No.61/2012 before the Sub-Registrar of Assurances (Rural), Chittoor, third respondent and is not yet registered and released. Thereafter, the third respondent has passed the refusal order on 17.01.2013 refusing to register the said document, which was questioned by the petitioner and one of the vendee's by way of an appeal vide Appeal No.1 of 2013 before the 2nd respondent.

By order dated 11.06.2015, the second respondent disposed of the said appeal directing the Joint Sub-Registrar, Chittoor (Rural) to register the document, in question, within 30 days from the date of that order. Petitioner now questions the said order on the ground that she had *bona fide*ly executed sale deed believing that the vendees will pay the full consideration, but they have not paid the remaining amount except advance amount.

3. I am unable to see how the petitioner can feel aggrieved when the appeal filed by her is allowed by the second respondent. Petitioner has admittedly executed a sale deed, which is pending with the Sub-Registrar, as stated above, and as such the petitioner has no claim or grievance against the official respondents and it is for the petitioner to workout her remedies by approaching appropriate Court of law so far as the against her vendees. Registerability or otherwise of the document therefore cannot now questioned by the petitioner, who herself is a vendor and on whose instance the document is registered.

4. The Writ Petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to take appropriate recourse of law as observed above.

5. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Writ Petition shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V.AFZULPURKAR, J

AUGUST 14, 2015
YVL

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V.AFZULPURKAR

-

-

WRIT PETITION No.24852 of 2015

-

Dt: 14.08.2015

YVL