

**HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE DILIP B.BHOSALE
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

WRIT APPEAL No.1827 of 2005

Date: 19.02.2016

Between:

Ravuri Lakshmamma W/o Narsi Reddy,
Aged about 55 years, Occu: Agriculturist,
Resident of Nagireddypalem, H/o Jaladanki,
Nellore District.

.....Appellant/
Petitioner

and

The Commissioner of Appeals, Office of the
Chief Commissioner of Land Administration,
Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad and three others.

.....Respondents

The Court made the following:

**HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE DILIP B. BHOSALE
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO**

WRIT APPEAL No.1827 of 2005

ORDER: (Per the Hon'ble Sri Justice P.Naveen Rao)

Heard Sri O.Manohar Reddy, learned counsel for appellant, learned Government Pleader for Revenue (AP) and Sri S.V.Muni Reddy learned counsel for 4th respondent.

2. Appellant is the petitioner in the writ petition. Appellant challenged the order of the Commissioner of Appeals dated 18.04.2005 in the Revision filed by her under Section 14 (A) of the Inams (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1956 (for brevity hereinafter referred to as 'Act, 1956'). The said revision was preferred against the decision of the Revenue Divisional Officer, Kavali, dated 28.03.2000 in the appeal preferred by the appellant.

3. The facts on record would disclose that the Mandal Revenue Officer and the Inam Deputy Tahsildar, Jaladanki granted inam patta to an extent of Ac.2.00 in Sy.No.2315/1 (Ac.1.88) and Ac.0.12 in Sy.No.2315/2P of Kesarivari Agraharam H/o Brahmanakraka in favour of the 4th respondent herein. This order was challenged in the appeal. The appellate authority held that the appellant herein has not produced any record to show that the schedule property belongs to her. In the revision also, the revisional authority on going through the records of the subordinate authorities held that due procedure was followed and that appellant has not shown any documents in proof of her claim to the title of the subject property. The learned single Judge called for records and having perused the records rejected the contention of the petitioner that due procedure was not followed in granting patta.

4. The only ground urged in this appeal is, due procedure as required under Section 3 of the Act, was not followed and that no notice was issued to the appellant. This Court by order dated 27.09.2005 made in W.A.M.P.No.3264 of 2005 granted interim stay as

prayed for by the appellant. Praying to vacate the said interim order, 4th respondent filed W.A.V.M.P.No.3714 of 2005. While considering the vacate petition, Division Bench called for the records and having perused the original records held that due procedure was followed by the competent authority. The Division Bench vacated the interim order by order dated 02.02.2006. In the counter-affidavit filed by the 4th respondent, it is asserted that appellant is no way concerned to the subject property and due procedure was followed before granting patta to the 4th respondent. These assertions are not denied by appellant/petitioner.

5. The appellant miserably failed in satisfying this Court on the perversity of findings recorded by appellate and revisional authorities. Having regard to the facts on record, we see no error in the decision arrived at by the learned single Judge. We see no merit in the writ appeal and it is accordingly dismissed. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the writ appeal shall stand closed.

DILIP B. BHOSALE, ACJ

P.NAVEEN RAO, J

Date: 19.02.2016
kkm

**HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE DILIP B.BHOSALE
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

WRIT APPEAL No.1827 of 2005

Date: 19.02.2016

kkm