

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHALLA KODANDA RAM**

-

**WRIT PETITION No. 10570 of 2015**

**ORDER:**

The petitioner challenges the order dated 31.01.2015 issued by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent-Tahsildar on the ground that through, admittedly, a revision is pending against the order dated 18.01.2014 passed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent-Revenue Divisional Officer, Miryalaguda mandal, in respect of the land in Survey Nos.566 and 558 of Kannekal village, Nidamanur mandal, Nalgonda district, the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent-Tahsildar cancelled the pattadar passbooks and title deeds issued in favour of the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that civil suits are pending and there is every likelihood of the respondents using the orders of the Revenue Divisional Officer, dated 18.01.2014, and the orders of the Tahsildar dated 31.01.2015, against the petitioner in O.S.No.133 of 2014 pending on the file of Senior Civil Judge, Miryalaguda, which was filed for injunction.

3. Learned Assistant Government Pleader points out that the order dated 31.01.2015 had made clear that the same is subject to the final orders that may be passed in the revision. The order, dated 18.01.2014, of the Revenue Divisional Officer is being implemented only on account of the fact that there is no stay granted against the orders of the Revenue Divisional Officer. However, the implementation is subject to the final orders that may be passed in the revision. This aspect has been made clear by the Tahsildar in his order dated 31.01.2015. In that view of the matter, learned Assistant Government Pleader submits that a direction may be issued to the revisional authority to dispose of the revision as there is no illegality as such in the order dated 31.01.2015 and the same does not call for interference.

4. A perusal of the order dated 31.01.2015 reveals that the Tahsildar had, in fact, taken care to record that the cancellation of Pattadar passbooks in favour of the petitioner is only on account of the orders passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer

on 18.01.2014 against which a revision has been filed by the petitioner. The Tahsildar had also taken care to record that the implementation of the order of the Revenue Divisional Officer is subject to the result of the orders that may be passed in the revision. In that view of the matter, the orders dated 31.01.2015 passed by the Tahsildar does not call for interference. However, considering the grievance of the petitioner that the orders of the revenue authorities are likely to be used in the civil suits against the petitioner to his detriment, in the interest of justice, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent-Joint Collector is directed to dispose of the revision within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending in this writ petition, shall stand closed.

---

**CHALLA KODANDA RAM, J**

15<sup>th</sup> April, 2015

KSM