

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.29393 OF 2017

Dated:30.08.2017

Between:

Tadepalli Satyanarayana,
S/o. Late Umamaheswara Rao,
Aged 65 years, Occ: Agiculture,
R/o.C-210, Apurupa Colony,
Jeedimetla, Hyderabad, presently
Residing at Pedakallepalli Village,
Mopidevi Mandal, Krishna District and others .. Petitioners

And

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep., by its
Principal Secretary, Revenue Department,
Velagapudi, Guntur District and others .. Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO**WRIT PETITION No.29393 OF 2017****ORDER:**

According to petitioners, father of the 1st petitioner was the owner of total extent of Acs.24.04 cents of land in R.S.No.367 of Bandar West, Krishna District. The father of the 1st petitioner executed a Will dated 28.09.1996 in his favour. Before execution of the Will, father of the 1st petitioner filed declaration under the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling of Agriculture Holdings) Act, 1973 and the Land Reforms Tribunal ordered restoration of possession and accordingly possession was delivered to his father. After alienating Acs.20.00 of land in favour of other petitioners, the 1st petitioner retained Acs.4.04 cents of land and applied for grant of pattadar passbook and title deeds. By endorsement dated 31.10.2015, the Tahsildar, Machilipatnam Mandal, Krishna District, rejected the request of the 1st petitioner on the ground that the land is in possession of the Government. Aggrieved thereby, petitioner preferred appeal before the Revenue Divisional Officer, Bandar, Machilipatnam, Krishna District, but the same was rejected affirming the decision of the Tahsildar. Challenging the same, petitioner preferred revision before the Joint Collector, Krishna District, and the same is pending consideration.

2. According to the 1st petitioner, he filed interlocutory application to condone the delay and also filed another application for grant of stay of allotment of assigned lands.

3. As seen from the material papers enclosed to the Writ Petition, the revision was signed by the petitioners on 10.08.2017.

It is not known, whether the stay petition was received by the revisional authority. Alleging inaction on the stay petition or appeal, this Writ Petition is filed.

4. Since delay petition is also filed, unless delay is condoned, appeal or stay petition cannot be considered. Thus, no relief as sought for by the petitioners can be granted.

5. The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed leaving it open to the petitioners to work out their remedies as available to them in law. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in the Writ Petition shall stand closed.

Date:30.08.2017

KH

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

