

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.3036 of 2016

BETWEEN

Yella Rajeshwar.

... PETITIONER

AND

State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Revenue Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 03.02.2016

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | Whether Reporters of Local newspapers may be allowed to see the Judgments? | No |
| 2. | Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reporters/Journals? | No |
| 3. | Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment? | No |

-
-
-
-

ORDER:

Petitioner herein filed O.S.No.55 of 2014 before the Principal Senior Civil Judge, Nirmal, for declaration of title and perpetual injunction against four defendants. Simultaneously, he filed an application before the fourth respondent seeking correction of revenue record and incorporation of his name in the possessory column for pahani for the current year. By impugned order dated 06.01.2015,

the fourth respondent, after obtaining report from the Village Revenue Officer and Mandal Revenue Inspector-I, issued necessary directions to incorporate the name of the petitioner for an extent of Ac.0.36 guntas as cultivator. Aggrieved thereby, the present writ petition is filed on the ground that the Tahsildar ought to have awaited adjudication in the suit in terms of Section 8 read with Rule 9 of the Rules framed under the A.P. Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass books Act.

2. I am unable to see how the petitioner can be aggrieved, as the impugned order is passed on his application and if at all the petitioner wanted to await the adjudication in the said suit, he ought not to have approached the Tahsildar by parallel proceedings. Hence, I am not inclined to entertain the writ petition, as the impugned order is, apparently, passed on the request of the petitioner himself.

However, petitioner is at liberty to approach the fourth respondent to withdraw his application for correction dated 02.09.2015 and if it is, accordingly, withdrawn, the fourth respondent will appropriately withdraw the impugned order based on that application.

The writ petition is disposed of. As a sequel the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

February 3, 2016
DSK

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J