

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.33820 OF 2017

DATED : 11.10.2017

Between :

Gunnala Jagan Mohan Reddy,
S/o.Malla Reddy, Aged 57 yrs,
Occu : Business, R/o.Flat No.307,
Gayatri Arcade, New Nagole,
Kothapet, Saroornagar, Hyderabad & others.

..

Petitioners

And

State of Telangana,
Rep., by Principal Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad & others.

...

Respondents



This court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.33820 OF 2017

ORDER :

Heard.

2. Petitioners are challenging the notice dated 13.09.2017 issued by the Tahsildar, Rajenderanagar Mandal.

3. A bare perusal of the notice would disclose that on an application made by Sri N.Prakash, the notice was issued. It appears Sri N.Prakash contended that wrong entries of names of Kamalakar Reddy, Jagan Mohan Reddy and Srinivas Rao, was shown in possession column against the land to an extent of Ac.3-18 guntas in Sy.No.16 of Katedhan Village and prayed for correction of possession column.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners fairly submits that the respondents before the Tahsildar and petitioners herein filed their objections to the said application before the Tahsildar.

5. As per Section 5 of the A.P. Rights in Land and Pattedar Pass Books Act 1971 (for short 'the Act'), Tahsildar is the competent authority to undertake exercise of carrying out corrections, amendment or updating of record of rights on an application filed before him. In view of the same, it cannot be said that the Tahsildar is not competent. Furthermore, any person aggrieved by wrong entry or seeking correction of entries or seeking alteration in the revenue records by virtue of the subsequent sale transaction or any development can make an application before the Tahsildar and on such application, the Tahsildar has to undertake enquiry and

after affording due opportunity has to pass orders accepting or rejecting the said application.

6. Since the Tahsildar is competent and notice was issued by the competent authority, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition at the initial stage of show cause notice and the same is liable to be dismissed in limini.

7. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed, leaving it open to the petitioners to work out their remedies as available in law, if they are aggrieved by any decision made by the Tahsildar. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

11th October 2017
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J

