

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V. NAGARJUNA REDDY

CONTEMPT CASE NO.688 OF 2015

DATED:26-02-2016

Between:

P. Hanumanthu ... Petitioner

And

Sri B. R. Meena

The Secretary,

Revenue (Land Acquisition) Department

The Government of Telangana State

Secretariat

Hyderabad

and others ... Respondents

COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONER: Mr. A. Vishnu Vardhana Reddy

COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS: G.P. for Land Acquisition (TS)

THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

ORDER:

-

While closing the contempt case, by order dt.26.6.2015, this Court directed respondent No.3 to file an affidavit before the Registry, on the expiry of two months, that the land acquisition proceedings have been completed and compensation has been paid to the petitioner. As no such affidavit has been filed, the contempt case has been automatically revived. Thereafter, respondent No.3 filed a counter affidavit wherein it is *inter alia* stated that the Award was passed on 21.8.2015 for an extent of Ac.41.38 gts., of land in Mantangode village, payment of compensation was made

to ten out of fourteen persons and for the remaining three persons bills were under process. It is further stated that as regards Bhoothpur Village, it was observed that the proposed land under acquisition is under cultivation of the pattadars, they have raised crops and as such the Joint Collector, Mahabubnagar, vide Lr. No.G1/213/2015, dt.17.08.2015, has directed the Land Acquisition Officer to submit withdrawal proposals. That accordingly the Executive Engineer (Irrigation and Command Area Development), 1B, Narayanpet Division, was requested to send withdrawal proposals, who submitted the said proposals, vide letter No.EE/1B/NRPT Division/Division Bench/AT0/2014/C, dt.14.11.2015, that later, under Section 93 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, the said proposals have been submitted to the District Collector, Mahaboobnagar, vide Letter No.F/317/2014, dt.14.11.2015, and that the same are under process.

In the light of the above facts, which are not controverted, the order of this Court has been substantially complied with. Hence, the contempt case is closed, however, with liberty to the petitioner to avail a fresh legal remedy in the event any of his grievances still remains redressed.

---

C.V. NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

26-02-2016

bnr