

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

\* \* \*

**WRIT PETITION No. 33602 of 2015**

**BETWEEN**

N.Narsing Rao and others

**... PETITIONERS**

**AND**

The State of Telangana, rep. by its Principal Secretary and others

**...RESPONDENTS**

Date of Order pronounced: 12.10.2015

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

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers Yes/No  
may be allowed to see the Judgments?

2. Whether the copies of judgment may be Yes/No  
marked to Law Reporters/Journals?

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

-

-

**ORDER:-**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned government pleader for Revenue.

2. Petitioners claim that they are in possession of different portions of land in Survey No.135 at Kothapet Village, Uppal Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. It is stated that under GO.Ms.No.166 dated 16.02.2008, petitioners had made several applications as early as on 30.04.2008 and while steps were being taken to dispossess them, they have approached this court in W.P.No.3364 of 2013 which was disposed of on 24.12.2013 directing the respondents to complete the process for regularisation and indicate the decision to the petitioners within three months and pending disposal of the said applications, possession of the petitioners over the plots shall not be disturbed. Petitioners now state that so far no such orders have been passed on their applications under Section 166 and there is now again a threat for eviction. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. It is evident that a District Level Committee had issued appropriate recommendations on petitioners' application under G.O.Ms.No.166 after inspecting the land and the said recommendations were pending before CCLA. While so, the said GO was placed under suspension in a PIL by a Division Bench of this court and subsequently, the Government has represented before the Division Bench that the said GO is now not in operation and fresh policy decisions under GO.Ms.No.58 and 59 are issued. Hence, if petitioners seek regularization of their possession under the respective plots, they have to apply properly under the said new GOs and request the Government to consider their cases for regularisation under the said new policy.

4. However, it is not in dispute that petitioner's applications made under GO Ms.No.166 are still pending and there was also a direction issued by this court in the writ petition referred to above. Hence, it is open for the petitioners to make a request to the first respondent to treat their pending applications under G.O.Ms.No.166 as the one under G.O.Ms.No. 58 or 59,

whichever is applicable, and shall also undertake to pay regularisation fee in terms of the said GO. If such applications are made, the first respondent shall consider the said request and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

With the above direction, 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

October 12, 2015

**LMV**