

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

-
W.P.No. 26317 of 2015

Between:

Borra Lakshmi and another

... Petitioner/s

and

-
State of Andhra Pradesh and others

-
... Respondent/s

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 24.8.2015

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

- | | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| 1 | <u>Whether Reporters of Local newspapers may be allowed to see the Judgments?</u> | <u>No</u> |
| - | | |
| 2 | <u>Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reports/Journals</u> | <u>No</u> |
| - | | |
| 3 | <u>Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment?</u> | <u>No</u> |

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

-
-
W.P. NO. 26317 of 2015

-
ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioners complain that at the instance of third respondent, the second respondent is insisting them to vacate their private patta land.

Learned Government Pleader for Revenue appearing for the respondents 1 and 2, on instructions, submits that an extent of Ac.1-70 cents in R.S.No. 122/1 situated at Guruvaigudem village, T. Narsapuram Mandal is purely patta land and that a civil dispute is pending between the petitioners and the third respondent which is subject matter of O.S.No. 185 of 2009 on the file of Junior Civil Judge, Chintalapudi and also another suit-O.S.No.113 of 2012 on the file of the same court. While so, the learned Government Pleader for Revenue further submits, the petitioners as well as the third respondent approached the second respondent on 14.8.2015 complaining of their existing dispute, but the second

respondent advised them to wait for the adjudication of the civil Court. He specifically submits that the second respondent is in no way concerned or competent to interfere with the civil disputes pending between the parties, hence the allegations made in the writ petition are denied.

Since a statement is specifically made on behalf of the second respondent that it is a private land and the second respondent is in no way concerned with the same, the writ petition appears to have been filed purely on apprehension and as such no further orders are necessary to be passed in this writ petition which is accordingly disposed of. Miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. No order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

Dt.24.8.2015
KR

