

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.27094 OF 2017

DATED : 16.08.2017

Between :

Smt Verukala Vara Lakshmi,
W/o.V.Venkata Ramana, Aged about 60 yrs,
Occu : Household, R/o.H.No.5-5-1064,
Saheb Nagar, Hyderabad.

..

Petitioner

And

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

...

Respondents



This court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.27094 OF 2017

ORDER :

Heard.

2. Petitioner claims to be the owner and in possession of Plot No.A/86, admeasuring 200 Square yards in Sy.No.14 part, Saheb Nagar Khurd, Hayathnagar Revenue Mandal, Ranga Reddy District. According to the petitioner, she purchased the said property from Jonnalagadda Venkata Mohan Kumar, by way of registered sale deed dated 12.02.1990. She obtained building permission on 08.09.2000 and constructed building comprising of ground + first floor. Earlier notice was issued under the Urban Land Ceiling Act, against occupancy of the properties on the said survey number alleging that the said property vests in Government. Aggrieved thereby, petitioner and several other residents instituted W.P.No.28241 of 2008. This Court by order dated 26.12.2008 made in W.P.M.P.No.37018 of 2008, stayed all further proceedings including dispossession of the petitioners pursuant to the impugned notice. Petitioner now alleges that the respondents are threatening to dispossess the petitioner and demolish the building already constructed by her.

3. As briefly noted above, the direction issued by this Court covers stay of all further action in pursuant to the show cause notice including dispossession, the question of dispossession of petitioner from the house and demolition of the house as long as interim order subsists, does not arise. It may be a different issue, if the petitioner has undertaken some additional construction or new

construction without obtaining prior permission after the interim orders are passed by this Court. The averments made in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition do not elicit any such steps taken by her.

4. Learned counsel states that no further construction is made and petitioner is in occupation of the house for the last more than 20 years.

5. Having regard to the above facts, I am not inclined to entertain the writ petition and the writ petition is accordingly dismissed. It is needless to observe that the petitioner may ventilate her grievance before the Special Officer and competent authority, Urban Land Ceiling, Hyderabad, State of Telangana (2nd respondent), if any subordinate authority illegally gives threat of dispossession or demolition. As and when such complaint is made, the 2nd respondent shall look into the same notwithstanding the dismissal of the writ petition. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

16th August, 2017
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J