

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C. PRAVEEN KUMAR

WRIT PETITION No.35145 OF 2016

ORDER:

This Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been preferred by the petitioner seeking to declare the inaction of respondents 2 to 4 in considering the representations of the petitioner dated 05.10.2015 and 15.04.2016 as illegal and arbitrary.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Government Pleader for Assignments (AP) for respondents. With their consent, the writ petition is disposed of at the stage of admission itself. There is no necessity to put respondent Nos.6 and 7 on notice as this Court is not venturing to adjudicate the issue on merits.

A perusal of the material placed before this Court would show that on 05.10.2015, the petitioner herein made a representation to the 2nd respondent herein seeking action against one Prabhakar, who was an ex-service man. The said representation was forwarded to the 3rd respondent vide letter dated 28.10.2015 seeking action as per existing norms in force and report compliance immediately for further action. On 03.03.2016, a reminder letter was also addressed to the 3rd respondent directing him to report compliance by 08.03.2016. Inaction on the part of the 3rd respondent is the subject matter of challenge in this Writ Petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioner mainly submits that though the District Collector has requested the Tahasildar to act

as per existing norms on the representation of the petitioner, till date no decision has been taken.

On the other hand, the learned Government Pleader for Assignments while opposing the writ petition placed reliance on ***Ch.Ramaiah v. District Collector and others***¹ wherein this Court held that when assigned land is sought to be transferred, it is incumbent on the part of the Mandal Revenue Officer to initiate proceedings for assignment of the land taking back possession and restore the possession to the original assignee or the legal heirs of such original assignee. On restoration, if the original assignee again transfers the land in favour of third parties, the Mandal Revenue Officer may resume the land from the transferee and it need not be assigned to the same assignee second time.

A perusal of the averments made in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition would show that the petitioner filed representations on 05.10.2015 and 15.04.2016 before the 2nd respondent stating that the land, which was assigned to him, was grabbed by one Y.Prabhakar, which could not be resisted at that point of time. The 2nd respondent forwarded those representations to the 3rd respondent directing him to enquire into those aspects and send a report.

Having regard to the facts in issue and considering the rival submissions made, the 3rd respondent-Tahasildar is directed to enquire into the representation made by the petitioner on 05.10.2015, which was forwarded by the District Collector to the Tahasildar, and send a report, keeping in view the judgment of this


¹ 2005 (6) ALT 358

Court relied upon by the learned GP, in accordance with law. It is needless to mention that the petitioner and also the unofficial respondents shall be heard before sending the report. The 3rd respondent shall send the report to the 2nd respondent as early as possible preferably within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions pending in this writ petition, if any, shall stand closed.

Date: 26.10.2016
sur



C. PRAVEEN KUMAR, J