

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.34855 OF 2017

DATED : 23.10.2017

Between :

Smt. Muktipati Krishna Veni,
W/o.Late Venkaiah, Aged about 84 yrs,
Occu : Household R/o.D.No.1-27-37,
D.V.C.Colony, Ponnuru Town,
Guntur District.

.. Petitioner

And

The State of Andhra Pradesh,
Rep., by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department,
Secretariat, Velagapudi,
Amaravati, Guntur District & others.

.. Respondents



This court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.34855 OF 2017

ORDER :

Heard.

2. This writ petition is filed praying to declare the action of the respondents in not considering the representation dated 19.09.2016 and 18.11.2016 of the petitioner for entering her name in the revenue records in respect of land to an extent of Ac.4-38 cents in Sy.No.421/3, of Millampalli Village, Yerragondapalem Mandal, Prakasam District as illegal and to direct the respondents to issue duplicate patta in respect of the above land.

3. A perusal of the record would disclose that on a request made by the petitioner earlier to the District Collector, the Tahsildar by way of his endorsement dated 28.08.2016 informed the petitioner that since no material is shown in support of the claim of any assignment/ownership; that the land is classified in the revenue records as Government land and that petitioner is not residing in the same village, the request for entering her name in the revenue records cannot be accepted. Therefore, the question of directing the respondent-Tahsildar, to consider the very same issue does not arise, more so, when there is no challenge made to the said proceedings.

4. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner sought to contend that as per the tabulated statement filed as material paper at Page No.19 downloaded from Mee-Bhoomi website of Government, the name of petitioner was wrongly typed as Mokkapati Krishna Veni instead of Muktipati Krishna Veni.

5. If what is stated above is true, it is the question of fact to be verified and the same also ought to have been agitated in the form of appeal against the decision communicated to the petitioner as early as 28.08.2016.

6. In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition.

7. Thus, leaving it open to the petitioner to work out her remedies, if so advised, aggrieved by the decision of Tahsildar communicated vide endorsement dated 28.08.2016, this Writ Petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

23rd October 2017
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J

