

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.4169 OF 2016

Date: 06.11.2019

Between:

Smt Chintalapally Manjula W/o.C.Ramdev Reddy,
Aged about 46 yrs, Occu : Govt. Service,
R/o.Mekaguda Village, Kottur Mandal,
Mahabubnagar District.

.....Petitioner

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep., by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad & others.

.....Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.4169 OF 2016

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Revenue.

2. This writ petition is filed alleging that even though survey was conducted and in terms of the survey report, sub-divisions have to be assigned in Sy.Nos.761, 759 and 750 to an extent of Ac.0-17 guntas, Ac.4-00 and Ac.0-25 guntas respectively of Mekaguda Village, so far no steps are taken to assign sub-divisions, causing hardship to the petitioner.

3. On written instructions, learned Government pleader, submits that petitioner filed O.S.Nos.63 of 2010 and 72 of 2012 pending in the Court of Junior Civil Judge, Shadnagar, praying to grant injunction on the subject lands. Sri Ch.Hanmanth Reddy and Ch.Ravinder Reddy who are sons of late Ch.Srinivas Reddy filed O.S.No.30 of 2014 pending in the Court of Junior Civil Judge at Shadnagar claiming their entitlement to the share in the subject lands and not to alienate the subject lands by the petitioner herein. On 22.04.2014 status quo order was granted by the learned Judge till further orders. The three daughters of petitioner filed O.S.No.112 of 2007 pending in the Court of Senior Civil Judge, Mahabubnagar for partition and separate possession which is renumbered as O.S.No.121 of 2014 and transferred to the Court of Senior Civil Judge at Shadnagar which is also pending. The husband of the petitioner filed O.S.No.100 of 2009 pending in the Court of Senior Civil Judge, Mahabubnagar, over land in Sy.No.761, together with other

lands. According to learned Government Pleader all these suits are pending.

4. In the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition there is no whisper on the interse disputes and pendency of civil suits.

5. In view of the fact that civil litigations are pending and it appears that status-quo order was granted in O.S.No.30 of 2014 the mandamus sought by the petitioner cannot be granted.

6. Thus, leaving it open to the petitioner to work out her remedies as available in law in the pending suits or after the disposal of suits, as may be advised, the Writ Petition is dismissed. Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

P.NAVEEN RAO, J

6th November, 2019
Rds

