

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

* * * *

-

WRIT PETITION No.35666 of 2015

BETWEEN

Velivela Jyothy.

... PETITIONER

AND

State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue (Land Acquisition) Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 09.11.2015

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:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader.

2. Petitioner makes a claim with respect to land admeasuring Ac.1.13 cents in Sy.No.402/2 (402/2A); land admeasuring Ac.2.26 cents in Sy.No.407/2 and land admeasuring Ac.0.99 cents in Sy.No.402/2 situated at Remalli village, Bapulapadu Mandal, Krishna District. Petitioner has filed the present writ petition against the action of the respondents in contemplating to pay compensation with respect to land admeasuring Ac.1.13 cents in Sy.No.402/2 (402/2A) to the sixth respondent notwithstanding her objections already filed before the third respondent.

3. Learned Government Pleader for Land Acquisition has secured instructions, which state that the sixth respondent was paid compensation as per land value rate fixed by the Government and thereafter, a representation was received from the petitioner claiming half share in the entire land including the well and bore well connected with agricultural service connection No.106 on the ground that pattadar pass book and title deeds were issue to her. It is stated that petitioner, therefore, requested not to pay compensation in respect of land admeasuring Ac.1.13 cents including well, bore well connected with agricultural service connection No.106 in Sy.No.402/2 to the sixth respondent and further requested the matter to be referred to the competent authority under the Central Act 30 of 2013. The third respondent has categorically stated that compensation with respect to well, bore well was not paid either to the petitioner or to the sixth respondent.

4. In view of the said statement, therefore, it is appropriate to direct the third respondent to consider the representations of the petitioner dated 02.07.2015 and 04.07.2015 and pass appropriate orders thereon in accordance with law and only thereafter, take further steps as to payment of compensation.

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

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

November 9, 2015

DSK