

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C. PRAVEEN KUMAR

WRIT PETITION Nos. 21003 and 21122 of 2016

COMMON ORDER:

-

Since both the writ petitions are inter-connected the following common order is passed.

W.P.No.21003 of 2016 came to be filed with the following prayer:

“Issue a writ of mandamus, declaring the action of the second respondent in granting LRS proceedings ID No.KUDA1013072/2015-2016 dated 09.06.2016 in favour of Medam Indira Devi in spite of the objections dated 09.05.2016 made by the petitioner in respect of her land in Sy.No.61/1 admeasuring 220 square yards, situated at Laskar Singaram Village, Hanumakonda Mandal, Warangal District, as illegal and void and contrary to the LRS Scheme provisions; and consequently to set aside the LRS Orders dated 09.06.2016.”

W.P.No.21122 of 2016 came to be filed with the following prayer:

“Issue a writ of mandamus declaring the action of the fourth respondent in trying to grant building construction permission in favour of Medam Indira Devi without considering the representations dated 21.04.2016 and 04.05.2016 of the petitioner's land admeasuring 220 square yards in Sy.No.61/1 situated in Laskar Singaram Village, Hanamkonda Mandal, Warangal District, as illegal and void; and consequently direct the fourth not to grant any building permission in favour of Madam Indira Devi.”

Heard Sri Mummaneni Srinivasa Rao, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in both the writ petitions, Government

Pleader for Municipal Administration and Urban Development, Sri M.Ajay Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.2 in both the writ petitions and Smt. Pingali Laxmi, learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.4 in W.P.No.21122 of 2016.

There is no necessity to put the unofficial respondent on notice as this Court is not venturing to adjudicate the issue on merits.

At the time when the matter is taken up for hearing, learned counsel for the second respondent, on instructions, submits that LRS Order is kept in hold in view of the disputes between the petitioner and Medam Indira Devi (Un-official respondent). That being the position, the grievance of the petitioner that the authorities ought not to have issued LRS proceedings need not be gone into. Since the LRS Order is kept on hold pursuant to disputes, the second respondent shall consider the representation dated 09.05.2016 made by the petitioner within a period of three (03) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. It is needless to mention that the second respondent shall hear the petitioner and the un-official respondent before proceeding further with the matter.

The grievance of the petitioner in W.P.No.21122 of 2016 is that though she made representations on 21.04.2016 and 04.05.2016 requesting not to accord permission to the un-official respondent for construction of house in plot No.22, but till date the same are not considered by the second respondent. Learned counsel for the second respondent submits that if the said representations are pending the same shall be considered in accordance with law.

Recording the statement made by the learned counsel for the second respondent, the second respondent is directed dispose of the representation dated 04.05.2016 made by the petitioner within a period of four (04) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order, after hearing both the parties.

With the above direction, both the writ petitions are disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

Consequently, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in these Writ Petitions shall stand closed.

**JUSTICE C. PRAVEEN
KUMAR**

29.06.2016
gkv