

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

* * * *

-

WRIT PETITION No.30412 of 2015

BETWEEN

M. Lakshmaya.

... PETITIONER

AND

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

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 05.10.2015

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 he has purchased an extent of Ac.0.91 cents in RS.No.226/3 of Pottipadu village, Krishna District under registered sale deed dated 11.11.2010 bearing document No.3686 of 2010 and made appropriate application under Form-VI(A) for issuance of pattadar pass books and title deeds by approaching the second respondent. The present writ petition is filed questioning the inaction of the second respondent in considering the application of the petitioner dated 19.08.2014 and passing appropriate orders.

2. Learned Government Pleader has received instructions, which state that the petitioner's vendor also executed a will deed for the very same land in favour of one Sri Kathula Subhash Chandra Bosu S/o. Kathula Mariyamma i.e. the adopted daughter of the said vendor on 24.02.2005 and the said person is stated to be in possession. In view of the disputes between two rival claimants, an appropriate endorsement is stated to have been given to the petitioner on 25.08.2015. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also been given a copy of the said endorsement.

3. In view of the said dispute on title, the second respondent, obviously, cannot adjudicate the said issue. Hence, no direction can be given to the second respondent as prayed for. However, petitioner is at liberty to take appropriate steps as prescribed under law against the said endorsement.

The writ petition is dismissed with the aforesaid liberty.

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

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

October 5, 2015

DSK