

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

* * *

WRIT PETITION No. 23418 of 2015

BETWEEN

Chilolakuru Rajagopal Reddy

... PETITIONER

AND

State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Principal Secretary and others

...RESPONDENTS

Date of Order pronounced: 29.07.2015

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 |

-

-

ORDER:-

Heard.

2. Petitioner apprehends dispossession in pursuance of the show cause notice given by the fourth respondent in Form-II bearing RCB No.820 of 2014 dated 20.12.2014. Petitioner, who is concerned with Survey No.135/3A-4 admeasuring Ac.3-26 cents, states that he has already filed representation to the District Collector dated 06.01.2015 with reference to the notice of the Tahsildar, with a copy marked to the Tahsildar. On the said representation, which was received by the District Collector, a direction was given by the Collector to the Tahsildar in L.Dis.(E1).516/15 dated 31.01.2015 to enquire into the matter and take necessary action. Petitioner states that no orders are passed so far by the fourth respondent but petitioner is being threatened with dispossession. Hence, questioning the notice the present writ petition is filed.

3. Since the writ petition is directed against the said show cause notice, neither any compelling reasons are made out by the petitioner as to why this court should intervene at that stage, particularly, as no ground is made out questioning and denying the jurisdiction of the Tahsildar to issue the said notice. Consequently, petitioner has already filed his explanation dated 06.01.2015 and as per the directions of the Collector, referred to above, the fourth respondent has to consider the same and pass appropriative orders.

4. Hence, the writ petition is disposed of directing the fourth respondent to consider the petitioner's representation and take appropriate decision in the matter as already directed by the Collector.

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

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

July 29, 2015
LMV