

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.43120 OF 2018

Date: 29.11.2018

Between:

Md.Sajid Siddiqui, s/o. late Zaheeruddin,
Aged 40 years, occu: Business, r/o.H.No.15-2-271,
KMC Campus, Rangampeta, Warangal.

.....Petitioner

and

State of Telangana, rep.by its Prl.Secretary,
Panchayat Raj Department, Secretariat,
Hyderabad and others.

.....Respondents



The Court made the following:

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.43120 OF 2018

ORDER:

Petitioner claims that his father was owner of land to an extent of Ac.8.26 guntas in Sy.No.118/2 of Chunchupalli village and mandal, Bhadradi-Kothagudem district. While so, petitioner alleges that for the land to an extent of Ac.3.16 guntas pattadar pass books and title deeds were issued in favour of 3rd respondent in the year 2013 without conducting enquiry and without notice to his father or to the petitioner or to his tenants. Based on the said pattadar pass books and title deeds, 3rd respondent is undertaking construction. Petitioner contends that aggrieved by the grant of pattadar pass books illegally, petitioner preferred revision before the Joint Collector and said revision is pending.

2. Petitioner earlier filed W.P.No.32591 of 2018 alleging inaction in disposing of the revision petition pending before the revisional authority. This Court disposed of the said writ petition on 11.09.2018 directing the 2nd respondent to pass orders on the stay application or in the main revision within a period of 2 to 3 months. The Court also ordered maintenance of *status quo* as on that date with regard to entries in the revenue records for a period of two months.

3. Admittedly, the name of 3rd respondent is reflected in the revenue records. Whether it was wrongly entered into and petitioner was entitled to notice before such entry are matters to be considered by the revisional authority in the pending revision. Until and unless revenue records are corrected, the contention of learned counsel for petitioner that land belongs to him cannot be

upheld in independent proceedings, more particularly when issue is with reference to illegal constructions being made by the 3rd respondent. Further petitioner makes a representation on 20.11.2018 to the Panchayat Secretary asking him not to permit construction activity and filed this writ petition immediately.

4. Having regard to the facts, as noted above, Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition. However, it is needless to observe that it is always open to petitioner to work out his remedies if a decision is made by the Joint Collector/ Revisional authority on his revision petition pending before him. Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed. Pending miscellaneous petitions shall stand closed.

Date: 29.11.2018
kkm

JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO



HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO



WRIT PETITION NO.43120 OF 2018

Date: 29.11.2018

kkm