

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.26290 OF 2017

Date: 07.08.2017

Between:

V.Laxma Reddy S/o Butchi Reddy, Aged about 37 years,
Occu:Business, R/o Yerravalli Village, Markuk Mandal,
Medak (Siddipet) District, Telangana.

.....Petitioner

and

The State of Telangana, rep.by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

.....Respondents



The Court made the following:

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.26290 OF 2017

ORDER:

Petitioner claims to have purchased the agricultural land to an extent of Ac.2.00 guntas in Sy.No.556/A/2 of Gangapur Village, Markuk Mandal, Medak (Siddipet) district. According to petitioner, representatives of the owner, sold the very same property and registered in the name of Pola Bujji. The said transaction was under challenge in O.S.No.99 of 2016 pending on the file of Senior Civil Judge, Siddipet. While so, 5th respondent applied for correction in the revenue records reflecting the 5th respondent in respect of the subject property. Having come to know the same, petitioner filed objections before the Tahsildar. Taking note of the objections, by endorsement, dated 02.01.2017, petitioner as well as 5th respondent were informed that as O.S.No.99 of 2016 is pending concerning the same subject property, the relief sought by the 5th respondent cannot be granted. While so, 5th respondent filed W.P.No.21855 of 2017 alleging inaction of the Tahsildar in not processing the petitioner's application, dated 16.11.2016 for mutating his name as pattadar in the revenue records. The said writ petition was disposed of, by order dated 05.07.2017, by taking note of the statement of the learned Assistant Government Pleader that application would be considered and disposed of within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

2. At this stage, learned counsel for petitioner alleges that though endorsement was already issued on 02.01.2017 rejecting the request of the 5th respondent, in the guise of directions issued by this Court in WP No.21855 of 2017, the Tahsildar is now trying

to take steps to enter the name of 5th respondent in the revenue records. A bare perusal of the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.21855 of 2017 would show that Court was under impression that no orders were passed by the time writ petition was taken up for consideration and, therefore, Court recorded the statement of the learned Assistant Government Pleader that appropriate orders would be passed within one month and dispose of the writ petition with directions.

3. If petitioner has any apprehension that in the guise of directions issued by the Court, the Tahsildar is likely to pass orders, nothing prevents the petitioner to bring to the notice of the Tahsildar the earlier endorsement and also nothing prevents him to raise the objections, even assuming that Tahsildar is contemplating to re-visit the issue and grant relief as prayed by the 5th respondent. As noted above, at this stage, it is only the apprehension of the petitioner that in the guise of directions issued by the Court in W.P.No.21855 of 2017, the Tahsildar is likely to take different view from the view already taken. Leaving it open to the petitioner to raise such objection as available in law, writ petition is dismissed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

Date: 07.08.2017
kkm

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO



WRIT PETITION NO.26290 OF 2017

Date: 07.08.2017

kkm