

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

MONDAY, THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION Nos.38942 OF 2014 AND 327 OF 2015

BETWEEN

Malothu Chandu and another

... PETITIONERS

AND

The Station House Officer, Julurpadu Police Station, Julurupadu Mandal,
Khammam District and another

...RESPONDENTS

The Court made the following:

-
-

COMMON ORDER:

Heard.

2. The grievance of the petitioner in these writ petitions is that his earlier complaint, dated 21.02.2012, was not acted upon by respondent No.1. Hence, complaining inaction, he approached this court by filing W.P.No.38942 of 2014. Petitioner also states that once again on 23.11.2014, he has filed another complaint with the similar allegations seeking protection with regard to the land allotted to him admeasuring Ac.9-08 cents of Vinobha Nagar, Julurupadu Mandal, Khammam District, within the jurisdiction of respondent No.1.

Since the subsequent complaint is also not acted upon, petitioner filed W.P.No.327 of 2015.

3. Learned Government Pleader for Home was required to get instructions in both the writ petitions. It is stated by the learned Government Pleader, on instructions, that no such complaint dated 23.11.2014 is received in the police station in spite of thorough verification of the records of the police station. So far as earlier complaint of 2012 is concerned, no instructions are received from respondent No.1 so far. However, the instructions state that it is always open for the petitioner to approach respondent-police station and file a fresh complaint and certainly appropriate action will be taken on it after conducting preliminary enquiry in the matter.

4. Hence, instead of adjudicating on the controversy as to whether petitioner's complaint is received by respondent No.1, as alleged by him or not, I deem it appropriate to dispose of these writ petitions by permitting the petitioner to approach respondent No.1 with a fresh complaint. If his grievance still subsists and if such a complaint is received, respondent No.1 shall examine the same and take appropriate action thereon, in accordance with law, without further loss of time.

Both the writ petitions are, accordingly, 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

January 27, 2015
LMV