

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

* * * *

-

WRIT PETITION No.35165 of 2015

BETWEEN

Smt. Narmada Devi Choudary.

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 17.11.2015

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

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

-

-

-

-

ORDER:

Petitioner claims that she is the owner and occupier of land admeasuring 250 sq. yards bearing plot Nos.35 and half part of 36 covered by Sy.No.5/1, 2 of Darapalem village, Mudisarlova Gram Panchayat, Visakhapatnam. Petitioner further claims that she has been in possession and enjoyment of the aforesaid land since 2011 by virtue of a registered sale deed. Alleging that there is illegal interference by the third respondent and trying to evict the petitioner from the aforesaid land, the present writ petition is filed.

2. On 29.10.2015, while the learned Government Pleader was required to get instructions, interim direction was given to the respondents not to dispossess the petitioner except after giving notice to her and an opportunity of filing explanation.

3. Learned Government Pleader has received instructions wherein the third respondent, *inter alia*, states that plot Nos.35 and 36 are covered by Sy.No.20 of Mudisarlova village, which is classified as Government land. However, no action for eviction, as on today, is taken against the petitioner. It is also stated that as and when action is intended to be taken against the petitioner due procedure will be followed in accordance with law.

Recording the aforesaid statement, therefore, the writ petition is disposed of directing the third respondent not to dispossess the petitioner except after following due process under law.

As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.
