

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.35752 OF 2017

DATED : 27.10.2017

Between :

Khaja Bahauddin S/o.late Khaja Sultan Ahmed,
Aged 63 yrs, Occu : Retd. Employee,
R/o.H.No.2-4-680/11, Sundar Nagar,
Kachiguda, Hyderabad

.. 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.35752 OF 2017

ORDER :

Heard.

2. This writ petition is filed alleging inaction by the respondents in not rectifying the mistakes/errors with regard to pattadar name and removing the name of the forefathers of the petitioner from the revenue records in Sy.No.224 to an extent of Ac.7-31 guntas, Sy.No.260 to an extent of Ac.12-05 guntas, Sy.No.313 to an extent of Ac.2-34 guntas and Sy.No.331 to an extent of Ac.9-39 guntas situated at Kyasampalli Village, Kamareddy Taluk, Nizamabad District.

3. The averments made in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition would disclose that according to registered sale deed of the year 1953, the mother of petitioner was the owner of land. In para no.4 of the affidavit it is stated that brother of the petitioner submitted several representations to take necessary steps for rectification of errors in the revenue records and also submitted reminders on 22.01.2007 and 06.03.2007 and thereafter proceedings were initiated in the year 2007, but no further action was taken. The matter has been pursued, further notices were issued and the higher authority issued directions to the subordinate authorities to take action. But the competent authority has not taken action. Hence, this writ petition.

4. These averments do not disclose as to when the entries in the revenue records were altered/changed and in whose favour those names were entered. The averments also do not disclose as

to when petitioners realized of wrong entries made and steps taken. It appears petitioner is trying to trace to 1953 document and to claim that entries were made in the revenue records. The persons whose names are reflected in the revenue records on the subject property are also not made parties in this writ petition. Thus, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition and grant the relief as prayed for merely on the allegation of inaction without placing correct facts and in the absence of persons whose names are reflected in the revenue records.

5. Hence, the Writ Petition is dismissed leaving it open to the petitioner to work out his remedies as available in law. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

27th October 2017
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J

