

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**Writ Petition No.22991 of 2015**

Between:

S.V.Raghavendra Rao

... Petitioner

and

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

... Respondent(s)

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 24<sup>th</sup> July, 2015.

**SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR**

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

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR**

-

**WRIT PETITION No.22991 OF 2015**

**ORDER:**

Petitioner's grievance is that his request for grant of pattadar

pass book and title deed with regard to land to an extent of Ac.17.34 gts in Sy.No.355/1/A/A of Chandrupatla Village, Kalluru Mandal, Khammam District was rejected by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent under the impugned order Rc.No.A/1709/2014, dt.30.06.2015.

Petitioner's counsel states that the said rejection is at the instance of several villagers as some of villagers claim to be in possession but they have not produced any documents in support of their claim, whereas the petitioners are admitted pattadars.

Be that as it may, the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent has decided the application after examining the objections of the villagers and passed order rejecting his application against which a clear remedy of appeal is available to the petitioner, where he can raise all his contentions. Therefore, I am not inclined to interfere with the impugned order or entertain the writ petition in the circumstances state above.

Petitioner is at liberty to avail the efficacious alternative remedy of appeal available to him and seek appropriate orders from the appellate authority. Since the impugned order refers to reversing of mutation entries from the revenue records, it shall however remain stayed for a period of two weeks.

With the above observation, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending if any, shall stand dismissed.

---

**VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J**

24<sup>th</sup> July, 2015.  
*gra*