

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.30679 OF 2017

DATED : 12.09.2017

Between :

Gadipalli Mallakka W/o.Late Ramaiah,
Aged about 71 yrs, Occu : Housewife,
R/o.D.No.2-39/2, Kaleswaram Village,
Mahadevpur Mandal,
Jaishankar District Bhupalpally,
Telangana State.

..

Petitioner

And

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

..

Respondents



This court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.30679 OF 2017

ORDER :

Heard.

2. According to the petitioner she and her three sons are joint owners and possessors of agricultural land to an extent of Ac.3-00 in Sy.No.67/1, Ac.0.05 guntas in Sy.No.73 of Palugula Revenue Village, Mahadevpur Mandal. Petitioner now apprehends that hectic efforts are being made by some third parties to alter the revenue records and mutate their names. Having come to know that such endeavour is being made, petitioner filed complaint before the Collector and District Magistrate on 31.08.2017. Earlier she filed complaint before the Joint Collector on 21.08.2017. At this stage, this writ petition is filed alleging that respondents 3 and 4 are changing the revenue records without following the due process of law, while the civil litigation is pending.

3. The averments made in the affidavit filed in support of this writ petition as well as in the representation stated to have been submitted by the petitioner it reflects that so far no application is filed for mutating the revenue records. There is no procedure envisaged in the A.P. Rights in Land and Pattedar Pass Books Act 1971, which can accept complaint/objections, even before the application is made by any person for mutating the name in the revenue records. Therefore, it cannot be said that the authorities have not acted upon the complaint filed by the petitioner or taking steps in mutating somebody's name in the revenue records even

before the process is set in motion. Therefore, the writ petition is mis-conceived and is liable to be dismissed.

4. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. It is needless to observe that if petitioner has subsisting grievance of any mutation as sought for, she has to work out her remedies as available in law, as and when the cause of action arises. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

12th September 2017
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J

