HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT

WRIT PETITION No.10122 of 2016

ORDER:

Heard Sri Ramalingeswara Reddy for petitioner, the Assistant Government Pleader (Revenue) for respondent Nos.1 to 4 and Sri Butta Vijaya Bhasker for respondent Nos.5 and 6.

The issue arises under the Andhra Pradesh Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971 (for short 'the Act').

The petitioner prays for Writ of Certiorari to call for records leading up to and inclusive of proceedings No.R.E.C.1084/2015, dated 15.02.2016 of respondent No.3-Revenue Divisional Officer, Adoni, Kurnool District and the resultant notice in R.C.B.No.221/2015, dated 17.03.2016, issued by respondent No.4-Tahsildar, Aspari Mandal, Kurnool District, and quash the same as illegal and without jurisdiction.

The circumstances relevant for disposing of the writ petition are stated thus:

The subject matter of the writ petition is Acs.3.61 cents in Survey No.266 of Banavanuru Village, Aspari Mandal, Kurnool District. Respondent Nos.5 and 6 on 20.07.2015 filed appeal before respondent No.3 praying for calling for the records of subject matter of writ petition, to conduct detailed enquiry and cancel the Pattadar Pass Books and Title Deeds issued in favour of the petitioner (respondent No.2 before the Revenue Divisional Officer/respondent No.3). Respondent Nos.5 and 6, admittedly, filed appeal under Section 9 of the Act. The wrong mention of provision of law, by itself, may not be a ground for interfering with the order impugned in the writ petition. The counsel for petitioner to this extent fairly states that the petitioner is not challenging the legality of the proceedings impugned on the ground that the appeal is filed by quoting a wrong provision of law. Hence, the merits of other contentions are considered and decided.

Respondent No.3 issued notice to petitioner in the appeal pending before him and through proceedings No.R.E.C.1084/2015, dated 15.02.2016, held that the petitioner and respondent Nos.5 and 6 are entitled to Ac.1.20 cents each and directed respondent No.4 to take consequential steps for issuing Pattadar Pass Books. As directed in the proceedings, dated 15.02.2016, respondent No.4 through proceedings R.C.B.No.221/2015, dated 17.03.2016, issued notice to the petitioner to surrender Pass Books, namely patta No.116 and Pass Book No.242416, to implement the direction issued by respondent No.3. Hence, the writ petition.

The petitioner relies on the decision of this Court in Ratnamma Vs. Revenue Divisional Officer[1], to which this Court (SVB,J) is a party and contends that appeal filed against the mere issuance of Pattadar Pass Books/Title Deeds under Section 6-A of the Act is not maintainable. The appeal filed by respondent Nos.5 and 6, unless is

[1] 2015(6) ALD 609 (DB)

brought under Section 5 (5) of the Act, i.e. question an order passed for amendment or updating of record of rights, respondent No.3 does not have jurisdiction. Therefore, in view of the principle laid down by this Court in Ratnamma case, the appeal is not maintainable. Further, no order is challenged by respondent Nos.5 and 6 before respondent No.3, the petitioner prays for setting aside the proceedings on the ground that respondent No.3 does not have jurisdiction to entertain the appeal against issuance of Pattadar Pass Books under Section 6-A of the Act.

Sri Butta Vijaya Bhasker contends that in the case on hand, having regard to endorsement RTI No.18 of 2016, dated 30.04.2016, by respondent No.4, respondent Nos.5 and 6 are completely rendered remediless against any decision taken or proceedings issued by respondent No.4. According to him, issuance of Pattadar Pass Book in favour of petitioner for the total extent otherwise disturbs or affects the rights claimed by respondent Nos.5 and 6, and whether the entries are as a result of preparation of record of right under Section 3 of the Act or result of amendment or updating of record permitted by respondent No.4. He concedes that the principle in Ratnamma case prohibits filing appeal under Section 5 (5) of the Act against mere issuance of Pattadar Pass Book/Title Deed (for short 'PPP/TD') and Ratnamma case does not deal with and decide the procedure followed while issuing PPP/TD under Section 6-A of the Act and the remedies available to an aggrieved party against illegal or improper exercise of power under Section 6-A of the Act.

Therefore, if the argument of petitioner is accepted, according to Sri Butta Vijaya Bhasker, the decision taken to issue PPP/TD, even if, arbitrary and illegal, results in adversely affects the rights of a party with reference to the entries maintained in records of right. Hence, in every case, a party is compelled to file suit for appropriate reliefs. The Act is a self contained enactment, denying the remedy of right of appeal to respondent Nos.5 and 6 firstly, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, is untenable and secondly, even assuming that without prejudice to the first submission, he tries to persuade the Court that the jurisdiction under Section 9 of the Act cannot be and could not be denied to respondent Nos.5 and 6 and contends that the revisional jurisdiction of Collector, according to him, in a given case contrary to Section 6-A (2) proviso PPP/TD is issued i.e. without updating the record, the revision is maintainable and the Collector /revisional authority has to maintain consistency between the record of rights and the PPP/TD.

Therefore, he submits that the statutory remedies available to an aggrieved party against arbitrary and illegal issuance of PPP/TD is required to be considered and protected keeping in view the scope, object and the purpose of the Act.

The Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue contends that Ratnamma case has considered the scope, purpose and object of both Sections 5-A and 6-A of the Act and held that appeal is not maintainable against a decision taken or issue of PPP/TD under Section 6-A of the Act. On the maintainability of the revision under Section 9 of the Act, it is contended that the Collector either *suo motu* or on an application made to him, firstly can call for and examine the record of any Recording Authority, Mandal Revenue Officer or Revenue Divisional Officer under Sections 3, 5, 5A or 5B of the Act in respect of any record of rights prepared or maintained to satisfy himself as to the regularity, correctness, legality or propriety of any decision taken, order passed or proceedings made in respect thereof and if it appears to the Collector that any such decision, order or proceedings should be modified, annulled or reversed or remitted for reconsideration, he may pass orders accordingly. The PPP/TD issued under Section 6-A of the Act does not have any independent standing, but it is a reflection of entries maintained in 1-B Register by the Recording Authority, Mandal Revenue Officer or Revenue Divisional Officer, as the case may be, therefore, an irregularity or illegality in issuing PPP/TD could be examined in revision under Section 9 of the Act. Adverting to the case on hand, particularly after taking note of endorsement issued by respondent No.4, he submits that respondent Nos.5 and 6 can file a revision challenging the entry, maintenance or continuance of the name of the petitioner in record of right together with issuing PPP, and the Collector is under obligation to call for the record, examine legality, correctness or propriety and pass any of the three orders which the Collector empowered to. According to him, the principle in

Ratnamma case ought not to be misunderstood as taking away the remedy of revision under Section 9 of the Act.

I have heard the counsel appearing for parties, perused the record and taken note of contentions urged by them.

The points for consideration are:

(1) Whether the proceedings No.R.E.C.1084/2015, dated 15.02.2016, filed by respondent Nos.5 and 6 as appeal before respondent No.3 is maintainable and the proceedings, dated 15.02.2016, are within the jurisdiction of respondent No.3? and

(2) Whether respondent Nos.5 and 6, who claim interest and right in the subject matter of the writ petition, if are aggrieved by issuance of PPP/TD under Section 6-A of the Act, can avail the remedy of revision under Section 9 of the Act?

Point No.1: The circumstances leading to the filing of the writ petition, the appeal filed by respondent Nos.5 and 6 before respondent No.3 and the proceedings, dated 15.02.2016, are not in dispute. From the record produced by Assistant Government Pleader and also from the prayer in the appeal filed before respondent No.3, this Court as a matter of fact can hold that respondent Nos.5 and 6 filed appeal against the grant of PPP/TD in favour of the petitioner. The subject matter of appeal neither refers to any order or decision either under Section 3 or under Section 5 of the Act.

Ratnamma case dealt with the following point:

"Whether an appeal to Revenue Divisional Officer under Section 5 (5) of the Act is maintainable against issuance of PPB/TD under Section 6-A of the Act?"

and held as under:

> "Sections 5-B and 6-A are introduced through Amendment Act 9 of 1994. Through the amendment, remedy of appeal against regularization order under Section 5-A of the Act and provision for issuance of PPB/TD under Section 6-A of the Act is enacted. Sub-section (3) of Section 6-A provides for correction of entries in the PPB/TD by the Mandal Revenue Officer either *suo motu* or on an application. As already noticed, the record- of- rights is prepared under Section 3 of the Act, updated/ maintained under Sections 4, 5 and also as a consequence of regularization under Section 5-A of the Act. Issuance of PPB is covered by Section 6-A of the Act. The PPB is nothing but a copy or reflection of entries in the record of rights prepared or maintained at one or the other stages under the Act as stated above. The PPB/TD is maintained and issued in Form No.14-C of the Rules. PPB/TD contains the entries as borne out by 1-B Register. With the issue of pass book to any person whose name in the applicable column is recorded in record of rights, it cannot be said such issuance adversely affects any person. A person is certainly aggrieved by illegal preparation of record of rights and against such illegal preparation the remedy is provided under Section 3(3) of the Act. Likewise, against illegal or erroneous updation of record of rights under Sections 4 and 5 or regularization under Section 5-A of the Act, the remedy of appeal under Section 5(5) or Section 5-B respectively is available to an aggrieved party. On the other hand, Section 6-A(3) provides for correction of erroneous entries in PPB/TD issued by the Mandal Revenue Officer. The reason for not providing any appeal against the issuance of PPB/TD is manifest from

the Scheme of the Act viz., that the issuance of TD/PPB does not by itself adversely affect the substantive right of a person, who claims or has a right in the property for which PPB is issued. In other words, the issuance of PPB/TD is a consequential act and entries in PPB/TD are mere reflection of entries of 1-B Register. Mere filing of appeal against issuance of pattadar pass book which is only a copy of 1-B register is not an efficacious remedy under the scheme of the Act.

It is well settled that the right of appeal must find its source in legislative authority. The right of appeal accrues to the litigant when it is expressly provided for in the statute and axiomatic that the right of appeal is a substantive right and must be conferred by a statute. As already held, appeal is provided for against the original proceedings or substantive determination under Sections 4, 5 and 5-A of the Act. The Legislature in its wisdom and noticing the purpose of issuing PPB/TD did not provide right of appeal against mere issuance of PPB/TD under Section 6-A of the Act. Therefore, on the literal construction of Sections 3 to 6-A of the Act, it can be held that the remedy of appeal under Section 5(5) of the Act is not provided against the issuance of PPB/TD under Section 6-A of the Act. By treating the action under Sections 5 and 6-A of the Act as single or mutually dependent, in our considered view, the remedy of appeal against mere issuance of PPB/TD under Section 6-A of the Act is not available. “

This Court has no option except both as a matter of fact and law to hold that the appeal filed against the issue of PPP/TD before respondent No.3 by respondent Nos.5 and 6 is not maintainable and consequently, the proceedings, dated 15.02.2016, are without jurisdiction and liable to be set aside. The point is answered accordingly.

At the outset, it is stated that the principle laid down by the Division Bench in Ratnamma case is binding on this Court and the principle laid down in Ratnamma case is taken note while answering point 2.

The submission of counsel for respondents is that the remedy of appeal against the mere issue of PPP under Section 6-A since is denied to an aggrieved person, it is in fitness of things that the entire scheme of the Act is considered and decided by giving the weight to other provisions of the Act as well.

The scheme of the Act through Sections 3, 4, 5 and 5A provides for (a) preparation of updating of record of rights, (b) intimation of acquisition of rights, (c) amendment and updating record of rights on the application received under Section 4 of the Act and (d) regularization of alienations and thereafter updation of record of rights respectively.

Section 6-A deals with issue of PPP/TD by the recording authority. The scheme of the Act is addition to what is stated above, provides for the statutory remedies of appeal and revision before the Revenue Divisional Officer and the Collector under Sections 5A and 9 respectively. In cases where a person is aggrieved by the entries in the record of rights may avail the remedy of suit before civil Court under Section 8 of the Act. In such cases the record of right is either maintained or updated as decided by the competent civil Court.

Section 6-A sub section (2) mandates the Mandal Revenue Officer to cause enquiry on the application made under Section 6-A sub section (1) of the Act in such manner as may be prescribed and shall issue PPP/TD in accordance <u>with the record of rights with such particulars and in such form as may be prescribed</u>. (emphasis added) Therefore, Section 6-A(2) empowers the Mandal Revenue Officer, after due enquiry to issue, PPP/TD, in accordance with the record of rights with such particulars and in such form as may be prescribed. Therefore, the corollary to possessing PPP/TD is that the same contains the details of record of right maintained in Form No.1. Proviso to Section 6-A(2) regulates the discretion of Mandal Revenue Officer in issuing PPP/TD only viz. upon the record of rights has been brought up to date. In the case on hand, the Mandal Revenue Officer without passing order or updating the record under one or the other provisions under the Act or issued PPP/TD to writ petitioner and respondents 5 and 6 pursued the remedy of appeal before Revenue Divisional Officer. For the view taken by the Division Bench in Ratnamma case the remedy of appeal against mere issue of PPP/TD is denied to an aggrieved person.

Now, the next question is whether an aggrieved person is also denied a statutory remedy against issue of PPP/TD under Section 9 of the Act or not.

<u>Point No.2:</u> As already noted, respondent Nos.5 and 6 claim Ac.1.20 cents each in Survey No.266 of Banavanuru Village, Aspari Mandal,

Kurnool District. According to respondent Nos.5 and 6, the petitioner, without right or entitlement to the entire extent of Acs.3.61 cents, secured PPP/TD in her favour. The issue of PPP/TD in favour of petitioner is not in accordance with 1-B Register maintained or the PPP/TD is issued pursuant to order passed under Section 5 of the Act. The existence of PPP/TD is not disputed either by the petitioner or by respondent No.4. Section 6-A of the Act and Rule 26 of the Andhra Pradesh Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Rules, 1989 deal with enquiry, issue of PPP etc., and Section 6-A excerpted hereunder:

Section 6-A: Pass book holder to have entries of alienation etc., recorded in Pass Book:-

(1) Every Owner, pattadar, Mortgagee, or tenant of any land shall apply for the issue of a pass book and title deed to the Mandal Revenue Officer on payment of such fee as may be prescribed. The owner-pattadar shall apply for the issue of a title deed in addition to a pass-book:

Provided that an occupant of an inam land is also eligible to apply for the issue of a pass book and title deed as an occupant:

Provided further that where no application is made under this sub-section the Mandal Revenue Officer may suo motu issue a Pass Book after following the procedure prescribed under sub-section (2) and collect the fee prescribed therefor.

(2) On making such application, the Mandal Revenue Officer shall cause an enquiry to be made in such manner as may be prescribed and shall issue a title deed and pass book in accordance with the Record of Rights with such particulars and in such form as may be prescribed:

Provided that no such title deed and pass book shall be issued by the Mandal Revenue Officer unless the Record of Rights have been brought up to date.

(3) The entries in the title deed and pass book may be corrected either suo motu or on an application made to the Mandal Revenue Officer in the manner prescribed.

(4) The Government may prescribe by rules the manner in which the title deed and pass book may be issued to all owners, pattadars, mortgagees or tenants and to such other person in accordance with the record of rights.

(5) The title deed issued under sub-section (1) and duly certified by the Mandal Revenue Officer, or such other authority as may be prescribed, shall be the title deed in respect of an owner-pattadar and it shall have the same evidentiary value with regard to the title for the purpose of creation of equitable mortgage under the provisions of the Transfer of Property Act, 1882 (Central Act 4 of 1882) as a document registered in accordance with the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908 (Central Act 16 of 1908) has under the law."

The scheme of the Act is considered by the Full Bench in Santosh Verma Vs. Joint Collector, Ranga Reddy District[2] and keeping in view the opinion of Full Bench, this Court examines point No.2. The proviso to sub-section (2) of Section 6-A of the Act regulates the jurisdiction of Recording Authority or Mandal Revenue Officer in issuing PPP/TD, by stipulating that PPP/TD shall not be issued by the Mandal Revenue Officer <u>unless the record of rights have been brought up to date (</u>emphasis added<u>)</u>. The words 'have been brought up to date", in sub-section (2) of Section 6-A, are

[2] 2011 (3) ALT 683 (FB)

related to or appreciated in the same way the words amendment and updating of record of rights used in Section 5 of the Act. Therefore, If PPP/TD is issued in conformity with the requirement of proviso to sub-section (2) of Section 6-A of the Act, then there is no difficulty in holding that a person aggrieved by the updation and resulting in issuance of PPP, works out the remedy of appeal under Section 5 (5) of the Act as decided by Ratnamma case. Sub-section (3) of Section 6-A authorizes the Mandal Revenue Officer to correct the entries in the PPP/TD, and scope of sub-section 3 is limited to correction of errors of entries and nothing more. Therefore by interpreting Section 6-A (2) of the Act, this Court holds that the recording authority in cases coming under Section 5 of the Act has jurisdiction to issue PPP/TD after the record is updated or amended. As in the present case, PPP/TD is issued, independent of or *de hors* the entries made in record of rights maintained under 1-B, then what is the remedy available to an aggrieved party is the moot point for consideration of this Court.

Section 9 reads as follows:

> 9. Revision:--The Collector may either suo motu or on an application made to him, call for and examine the record of any Recording Authority, Mandal Revenue Officer or Revenue Divisional Officer under Sections 3, 5, 5-A or 5-B, in respect of any record of rights prepared or maintained to satisfy himself as to the regularity, correctness, legality or propriety of any decision taken, order passed or proceedings made in respect thereof and if it appears to the Collector that any such decision, order or proceedings should be modified, annulled or reversed

> or remitted for reconsideration, he may pass orders accordingly:
>
> Provided that no such order adversely affecting any person shall be passed under this Section unless he had an opportunity of making a representation.

In interpreting or construing a statute or its provisions the obvious and first method is literal interpretation. Then the question for consideration is what constitutes literal meaning. It is axiomatic that "literal meaning" means the meaning given to the words in a dictionary. Further the meaning a word changes depends on the company of other words. This is expressed by words are interpreted _noscitur a sociis_. _Noscitur_ means to know and _sociis_ means association. Now this Court is interpreting Section 9 i.e. Statutory Revisional Jurisdiction of Collector. The extent of power of revisional authority is determined by the words employed in the Section conferring jurisdiction on any authority.

The Collector is given power of entertaining revision either suo motu or on an application filed by an aggrieved party. The Collector in a pending revision is entitled to call for and examine the record of order under revision viz. from (a) recording authority, Mandal Revenue Officer or Revenue Divisional Officer under Sections 3, 5, 5A or 5B in respect of any record of right prepared or maintained to satisfy himself as to the regularity, correctness, legality or propriety of any decision taken, order passed or proceedings made in respect thereof. (b) The Collector has jurisdiction to modify, annul, reverse or remit for reconsideration of a decision, order or proceedings made in respect of record of rights. From plain construction of Section 9, this Court is of the view that the revisional jurisdiction of Collector embraces different situations warranting interference by him and thus ensures maintenance, preparation or continuation of record of rights on the touch stone of the entries being regular, correct, legal or propriety. I would refer to Ramanatha Aiyer's Law Laxicon and Webster's Dictionary for excerpting the meaning of the words viz. Regularity; correctness; legality and propriety.

> **Correct**: (As an adjective) In accordance or agreement with a certain standard model, or original; conformable to truth; rectitude or propriety; not faulty; free from error; accurate. (As a verb) To make straight or right; remove error from; bring into accordance with a standard; point out errors in.
>
> 'ness' attached to adjectives and participles forming abstract nouns denoting quality and state.
>
> Correctness means conforming to fact or truth etc.
>
> 'Regular' is derived from "regula", meaning "rule", and its first and legitimate signification, according to Webster, is "comfortable to a rule; agreeable to an established rule, law, or principle, to a prescribed mode, or according to established, customary forms."
>
> **Regularity**: The state or character of being regular i.e. to mean conformable to a rule; methodical; periodical.
>
> <u>Webster:</u>
> **Legal**: Lawful, that is, something effectual and proper and which the Courts of judicature of the country will recognize and enforce; opposed to that which is illegal or

unlawful; allowed or authorized by law; implied or imputed in law; opposed to actual; sufficient to meet the requirements of law; a term which refers to common law as distinguished from equity.

Legality: Lawfulness.
Legality and propriety: The expression 'legality and propriety' occurring in Section 78(1) of the Act does not limit the jurisdiction of the Labour Court to a revisional jurisdiction. Any order made by the employer under the standing order is subject to the jurisdiction conferred on the Labour Court under Section 78 of the Act, which can scrutinize the 'legality and propriety' of the order.

Propriety: propriety has been stated to mean 'fitness; appropriateness, aptitude; suitability; appropriateness, to the circumstances or condition conformity with requirements; rules or principle, rightness, correctness, justness, accuracy.

In a case where the jurisdiction of revision against issue of PPP/TD is invoked, from the above discussion, it can be construed that the Collector firstly calls for the record of rights and examines the issue of PPP/TD on one or the other parameters viz., Regularity; Correctness; Legality or Propriety and if satisfied that the decision, order or proceeding should be modified etc., the revision disposed of keeping both the entries in record of rights and the extract viz. PPP/TD. The Collector has wide power and jurisdiction vis-à-vis the record of right under Section 9 of the Act against the order passed by Recording Authority, Mandal Revenue Officer or Revenue Divisional Officer, to examine the regularity, correctness, legality or propriety of any decision taken, order passed, or proceeding made in respect thereof and remit the matter to Mandal Revenue Officer for decision afresh.

Therefore, as in the case on hand the issue of PPP/TD attracts one or the other grounds of revision referred to above for challenge and a revision under Section 9 against issue of PPP/TD is maintainable before the District Collector under Section 9 of the Act. The Collector in the revision filed before him is required to call for the record of right maintained by the Mandal Revenue Officer, examine the particulars contained in the PPP challenged in revision viz., whether conform to Section 6-A (2) or proviso thereto, conduct enquiry and pass one or the other orders specified in Section 9.

Issuing PPP/TD without passing an order ought to be treated as a serious lapse on the part of the recording authority and appropriate steps are taken by District Collector in ensuring compliance with Section 6-A (2) and to avoid burden on the statutory authorities or on the Courts.

The association of these two groups of words namely, “Regularity; Correctness; Legality; or Propriety” and “Modified, Annulled, Reversed or Remitted for Reconsideration” keeping with each other in the scheme of Section 9 of the Act, this Court construes that the comprehensive meaning attributable to each one of the words is attracted while entertaining the jurisdiction or deciding the revision filed before District Collector. In addition to the reasons already given by construing as stated supra, this Court holds that against the mere issue of PPP/TD a revision under Section 9 is maintainable.

Having regard to the scope of Section 9 of the Act, a person, if aggrieved against an entry made or maintained in record of rights or continued to be maintained by recording authority can file revision under Section 9 of the Act. Likewise on the same analogy the aggrieved person can file revision against the issuance of PPP/TD. The Collector is obliged by the revisional jurisdiction he enjoys to examine all the aspects namely regularity, correctness, legality or propriety in the issue of PPP/TD and pass orders on the entries in record of rights and also on the legality or otherwise of PPP/TD against which revision is made before him. This Court is of the view that by adopting the above interpretation to Section 9 and Section 6-A of the Act before a litigant is compelled to work out the remedies under Section 8 of the Act, can avail the remedy within the framework of the Act by filing revision and obtain orders in this behalf. The point is answered by holding that in cases where the PPP/TD is issued either in breach of sub-section (2) of Section 6-A of the Act or otherwise particularly without an order or proceeding under Section 5 of the Act, an aggrieved party is not without remedy and legal wrong can be canvassed by fling revision under Section 9 of the Act. The remedy available under Section 8 of the Act is always independent and a party if advised, whether before filing the revision or after awaiting the outcome of revision, can work out the remedy of establishing title etc before the competent civil

Court. The other remedies referred in Ratnamma case are to be understood as held in this order.

Having answered Point No.2 in favour of respondent Nos.5 and 6, and particularly, after perusing the record, to meet the ends of justice, this Court orders the writ petition as follows:

(a) Proceedings No.R.E.C.1084/2015, dated 15.02.2016, of respondent No.3 and consequential notice in R.C.B.No.221/2015, dated 17.03.2016, of respondent No.4 are set aside;

(b) Respondent Nos.5 and 6 are given liberty, by enclosing a copy of this order, to file revision against the maintenance of revenue record/issue of pattadar pass book in favour of petitioner before respondent No.2 within four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The revision if filed as permitted by this Court, respondent No.2 is directed to entertain and dispose of the same within three months by issuing notice to the petitioner and also by calling the record from the Office of respondent No.4.

After the order is dictated, one of the counsel suggests that to prevent further litigation in the matter, the parties may be directed to maintain *status quo* in all aspects for a period of four months.

The statement is placed on record accordingly.

The parties are directed to maintain *status quo* in all aspects as on date for a period of four months.

Writ petition is ordered as indicated above. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

S.V.BHATT, J

Date:11.10.2017

Note:
L.R. copy to be marked.
B/o.
Kdl/Stp