

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

* * *

WRIT PETITION Nos. 23033 AND 23035 of 2015

BETWEEN

T.Srinivasa Rao and others

... PETITIONERS

AND

The Tahsildar, Kasimkota Mandal, Visakhapatnam District and others

...RESPONDENTS

Date of Order pronounced: 31.07.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? | Yes/No |
| 3. Whether his Lordship wish to see the
fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

-

-

COMMON ORDER:-

Heard.

2. Petitioners in W.P.No.23033 of 2015 claim that each one of them were granted house site plots in the Government poramboke land in Survey Nos.11, 110 and 111 of Kasimkota Village, Visakhapatnam District. Petitioners were granted plot Nos.90, 87, 97, 88, 72 in survey No.11P of Kasimkota Village and that under Indiramma (Phase-III) Scheme, Housing Corporation has sanctioned loans and they have also made constructions upto lintel levels. Petitioners in W.P.No.23035 of 2015 states that they have been given possession certificates with regard to plot Nos.4, 19, 24, 7 and 3 respectively in Survey Nos.11, 110 and 111 of Kasimkota Village, Visakhapatnam District, and that they have also made constructions upto lintel levels with the loan sanctioned by the Housing Corporation. Alleging that there was threat of dispossession by the officials of the first respondent, these writ petitions are filed.

3. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue has received instructions from respondent No.1, which specifically state that they have not yet dispossessed any one from survey No.11 part of Kasimkota village in respect of the plots claimed by the petitioners and that none of the petitioners can have grievance. It is further stated that as and when any action is proposed to be taken against the petitioners, they would be given appropriate notices.

4. It is apparent from the instructions that no action, as apprehended by the petitioners, is taken by respondent No.1 against them and that if and when any action is required to be taken, respondent No.1 states that he would follow due procedure under law. In view of that, no further directions are required.

The writ petitions are disposed of. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

July 31, 2015
LMV

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J