

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT

WRIT PETITION No.3245 of 2017

ORDER:

Heard Mr.A.Prabhakar Rao for petitioner and the Assistant Government Pleader for respondents.

The grievance of petitioner is against not incorporating the name of petitioner in the web land/e-register maintained by respondents under the A.P.Rights in Land and Pattadar Pass Books Act, 1971 for Sy.No.312 in an extent of Ac.4-90 cents at Kapuluppada Village, Bheemunipatnam Mandal, Visakhapatnam District, as illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional.

Mr.Prabakar Rao, having regard to the stand taken by 4th respondent in the counter affidavit, which reads as follows :-

“

The contention of the writ petitioner in this para that on the application of his husband dt.2-5-1988, the then Mandal Revenue Officer, Visakhapatnam has granted assignment of Government land measuring Ac.4-90 cts in S.No.312 of Kapuluppada village to her husband during his life time is not correct, no such recorded evidence in having grant of assignment to the husband of the writ petitioner is forth coming. Further it is submitted that the then Tahsildar, Bheemunipatnam in the year 2012-2013 has thoroughly verified all the assignment files of all villages in the mandal and prepared village wise list of assignments made in mandal. In the list pertaining to Kapuluppada village, the name of the husband of the writ petitioner was not found as assignee in S.No.312 of Kapuluppada village.

However, it is submitted that if the writ petitioner files her request/ application through Mee-Seva along with recorded evidence

in support of his claim, the same will be examined with reference to records of this office and also ground position and necessary action will be taken on merits.”


requests the Court to permit the petitioner to apply as per the extant procedure and if the inaction continues, thereafter invoke the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

The writ petition is disposed of by granting liberty to petitioner to apply in accordance with the applicable procedure.

This Court has no reason to doubt that as the petitioner proposes to apply as desired by 4th respondent, there would be no further inaction in considering such request.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending, shall stand closed.
No order as to costs.

Dt: 16-04-2018
Prv


S. V. BHATT, J

