

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT

W.P.No.10722 OF 2017

ORDER:

Heard Mr.K.SMurthy for petitioner and the Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue.

The petitioner apprehending individual consideration of claim of 5th respondent for regularization of a plot claimed by petitioner as well as 5th respondent herein, though the issue is pending before the 2nd respondent for consideration, has filed the instant writ petition for the following relief:

“.....to issue a writ, order or direction, more particularly, one in the nature of WRIT OF MANDAMUS declaring the action of the respondent authorities in not considering and finalizing the representation of the petitioner to the District Collector in September 2015 and December 2015 in continuation of the application made earlier and the action of the other revenue officials in preparing reports behind the back of the petitioner regarding, the 75 sq. yards of land in TS No.773, at D.No.18-40-94, Opposite Panchavati Apartments, Sangadigunta, Guntur as illegal and unconstitutional and consequently direct the respondent authorities to consider the applications made by the petitioner for regularization of house plot to the extent of 75 sq. yards of land in TS No.773, at D.No.18-40-94, Opposite Panchavati Apartments, Sangadigunta, Guntur basing upon the occupation and enjoyment of the petitioner for long time and regularise the same after directing the district collector not to rely upon the endorsement made by the Tasildar on 9-9-2015 setting aside.....”

After perusing the material available on record, this Court is of the view that the writ prayer for the present is based on apprehension. The petitioner admittedly has filed a detailed representation dated 30.09.2015 before the 2nd respondent in

support of her case for regularization of the subject matter of the writ petition. The representation and the regularization are pending consideration before the 2nd respondent. The petitioner further voices the apprehension that the 2nd respondent even if takes a decision may not communicate the decision so taken on the issue of regularization of 75 sq.yards, which is claimed by petitioner as well as 5th respondent. The statement is referred in this order. This Court has no reason to doubt that once the 2nd respondent considers the case of regularization of either the petitioner or 5th respondent for 75 sq.yards, the outcome of such consideration is naturally expected to be communicated to the parties. For complying with such routine matters, separate directions are not required.

With the above observation, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Consequently, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, stand closed.

05th June, 2017
Lrkm

S.V.BHATT,J