

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.37894 of 2015

-

23.11.2015

Between:

V.Harinder

.. Petitioner

and

The State of Telangana,

represented by its Principal Secretary,

Municipal Administration and Urban Development Department,

Hyderabad and others

.. Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner: Mr.T.Vishnu Teja

Counsel for respondent No.1: Assistant Government Pleader

for Municipal Administration and Urban Development (TS)

Counsel for respondent Nos.2, 5 and 6: Assistant Government Pleader

for Revenue (TS)

Counsel for respondent Nos.3 and 4: Mr.Ch.Madhu,

standing counsel for the Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation (GHMC)

The Court made the following:

-

-

-

-

-

-

ORDER:

The petitioner, who claims that Quarter No.24 in Block No.1 of Bhoiguda Slum was allotted to his junior paternal uncle, viz., Chinna Narsimha, pleaded that as the said allottee died unmarried, the petitioner has succeeded to his estate. It is his further pleaded case that due to the serious sickness of his wife, he has taken a hand loan of Rs.60,000/- from one D.Hanumanth Rao and in consideration thereof, he has allowed the creditor to use his quarter for the purpose of performing the marriage of his daughter and that as his wife was seriously ill, he has shifted his residence to Nacharam along with his children in the year 2005. It is also the pleaded case of the petitioner that recently, he came to know that an enquiry was being conducted by the officials of respondent No.3 for the purpose of allotment of the quarters including the one which he has succeeded to and that his information secured under the Right to Information Act, 2005, revealed that his quarter was allotted to one Mrs.D.Sujatha, W/o Sunil Kumar, who is none other than the younger daughter-in-law of his creditor – D.Hanumanth Rao. The petitioner further pleaded that on coming to know about the same, he has made as many as ten representations commencing from 06.08.2014 up to 31.08.2015 to respondent Nos.2 to 6. The grievance of the petitioner is that these representations are not being considered.

Mr.Ch.Madhu, learned standing counsel for the Greater Hyderabad Municipal

Corporation (GHMC) appearing for respondent Nos.3 and 4, on instructions, submitted that on conducting a socio-economic survey, the quarters were allotted to the persons, who are found eligible and living below the poverty line and that therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief.

Having regard to the nature of the grievance expressed by the petitioner, this Court is not presently concerned with the question as to whether he has succeeded to the estate of his junior paternal uncle and if so, whether he is entitled to be recognized as his legal heir and secondly, whether he has a right over the quarter in question. As noted hereinbefore, the grievance of the petitioner is that the respondents have not been considering his representations on the issue of allotment.

Therefore, respondent No.4 is directed to consider the grievance of the petitioner, hold an enquiry, pass a speaking order and communicate the same to the latter within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Subject to the above direction, the Writ Petition is disposed of.

As a sequel to disposal of the writ petition, W.P.M.P.No.48753 of 2015 filed by the petitioner for interim relief shall stand disposed of as infructuous.

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

23rd November, 2015

GHN

