

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

**THURSDAY, THE THIRD DAY OF AUGUST TWO
THOUSAND AND SEVENTEEN**

**Present
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

WRIT PETITION No.25776 of 2017

Between:

Gurala Jagga Reddy
S/o. Chinna Lachi Reddy,
R/o. Yellamma Temple Road,
Husnabad Village and Mandal,
Siddipet District and 2 others.

.. Petitioners

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh,
Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department, Secretariat,
Hyderabad and 3 others.

.. Respondents

The Court made the following:

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.25776 of 2017

ORDER:

1. Heard.
2. On 04.07.2017, the Tahsildar (4th respondent) issued notice to petitioners calling upon them to explain why lavoni patta granted to them should not be cancelled and possession should not be taken. It was alleged that petitioners are not cultivating the land. Petitioners came to have submitted the explanation on 24.07.2017. At this stage, without waiting for further orders to be passed by the Tahsildar, in consideration of the explanation submitted by the petitioners, this writ petition is filed.
3. Primarily, the grievance of the petitioners appears that even before the orders are passed by the Tahsildar on the explanation submitted by them, the respondent authorities are seeking to dispossess them from the subject property.
4. As briefly noted, notice was issued on 04.07.2017 and according to the petitioners, the same was received by them on 22.07.2017 and in response, they filed explanation on 24.07.2017. Thus, it cannot be expected that the authority required to pass orders soon after the

explanation is filed. With regard to the fact that notice was already issued and the explanation submitted by the petitioner is under consideration by the Tahsildar, it cannot also be said that Tahsildar would hurriedly take possession of the subject property, before passing appropriate orders, as required under law.


5. Thus, the grievance of the petitioners agitated in the writ petition is in the form of mere apprehension. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition at this stage.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed, leaving it open to the petitioners to work out their remedies available under law, if so advised. No costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Contempt Case shall stand dismissed.

P.NAVEEN RAO, J

Date: 03.08.2017
dv



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO



WRIT PETITION No.25776 of 2017

Date:03.08.2017

dv