

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.30085 OF 2017

Date: 08.09.2017

Between:

P.Amrutha W/o Pitta Narayana Reddy,
Aged about 73 years, R/o D.No.13-7-882,
Korlagunta Road, Tirupati, Chittoor Dist.

.....Petitioner

and

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

.....Respondents



The Court made the following:

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.30085 OF 2017

ORDER:

Petitioner is aggrieved by the information furnished to her showing that no market value is fixed for the properties against which deed of conveyances are presented since they are classified as Government lands. Petitioner challenges the said information furnished to her on the ground that in website of Registration Department, these properties are not classified as prohibited properties and, therefore, action of respondents in not furnishing market value of these properties is illegal.

2. Having regard to this submission made by the learned counsel for petitioner, learned Government Pleader was directed to obtain instructions.

3. Today learned Government Pleader produced copy of the District Gazette bearing No.7/15, dated 07.07.2015 and the relevant extract of the gazette publication showing the lands claimed by the petitioner as included in the prohibited list of properties.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner sought to contend that as the gazette notification is of the year 2015 and website of Registration Department, which is reflected now, do not show the survey numbers which petitioner claimed as owned by him, the old gazette cannot be relied upon.

5. No other material is placed on record to show that earlier inclusion of properties in the prohibited list is subsequently reviewed and properties claimed by the petitioner are excluded.

Thus, it cannot be assumed, merely because, the website of Registration Department do not reflect the survey numbers as in the prohibited property list that said properties are not prohibited. More so, the information furnished to the petitioner by the registering authority on market value would show the value as 'zero', which mean no registration can be made. Therefore, at this stage, Court is not inclined to go into merits of the contentions urged by the learned counsel for petitioner. At this stage, learned counsel for petitioner seeks leave of the Court to submit an application before the District Collector requesting to exclude the properties claimed by her as owned from the list of prohibited properties.

6. In view of the said submission, though writ petition is dismissed, liberty is granted to the petitioner to submit application before the District Collector along with all relevant documents in support of her claim including latest description of properties in the Registration Department website. As and when such application is made, the District Collector shall consider the request of petitioner and take appropriate decision as warranted by law and communicate the decision to the petitioner by a reasoned order and entire exercise shall be completed within a period of two months from the date of receipt of such application.

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: 08.09.2017
kkm

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO



WRIT PETITION NO.30085 OF 2017

Date: 08.09.2017

kkm