

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.V.SESHA SAI

WRIT PETITION No.31842 of 2017

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Government Pleader for Municipal Administration & Urban Development.

The Vice-Chairman, Visakhapatnam, Urban Development Authority, Visakhapatnam-second respondent herein passed an order vide proceedings in Rc.No.6669/06/Estate/II dated 14.08.2015, last two paragraphs of which read as under:

“Therefore, in view of the above fact, it is evident that the plots allotted to Sri Penmetsa Krishnam Raju, as per his option, viz., plot Nos.18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 60 and 64 in the Paradesipalem phase-II layout are not covered in the land contributed by him for the Land Pooling Scheme. And inspite of ample opportunity being given to him to resolve this issue which arose on account of his improper exercise in choosing the plots other than the land contributed by him in 155/3 of Paradesipalem, it is ordered that the allotment of the plots made by VUDA to Sri Penmetsa Krishnam Raju, vide Rc.No.6669/2006/Estate/II dated 07.03.2015 issued in the name of VC, VUDA is hereby cancelled.

As and when both the parties i.e. Sri Penmetsa Krishnam Raju and M/s P.J.S.R.Hi-Tech Projects Pvt.Ltd., come up with a consensus on the sharing of plots covered in Sy.No.155/3 of Paradesipalem-II Phase Layout then re-allotment proceedings for their land holders share will be issued accordingly, as per the eligibility”.

Now, it is the case of the petitioner herein that, on 14.10.2016, after arriving at a consensus, the petitioner herein

and M/s P.J.S.R.Hi-Tech Projects Private Limited, Visakhapatnam jointly submitted a representation to the second respondent. The grievance of the petitioner, as submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner, is that, despite acknowledging the said representation, dated 14.10.2016, no action has been taken by the respondent Nos.2 and 3 so far.

Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the second respondent, Sri P.Jagadish Chandra Prasad, this Court, in the facts and circumstances of the case, deems it appropriate to dispose of the Writ Petition, directing the second respondent to pass appropriate orders on the representation, dated 14.10.2016, said to have been submitted by the petitioner herein, if not already disposed of, strictly in accordance with law, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

The Writ Petition is, accordingly, disposed of. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the Writ Petition, shall stand closed.

A.V.SESHA SAI, J

03rd October, 2017

Note:

*Furnish C.C. of the order
within one week.*

*B/o
Tsy*