

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

CC No.1139 of 2017

ORDER:

This contempt case is filed under Sections 10 to 12 of Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 seeking to punish the respondents for their willful, deliberate and intentional violation of the order dated 11-04-2016 passed by this Court in CC No.1942 of 2015.

02. CC No.1942 of 2015 was filed alleging violation of the order dated 02-07-2007 passed in WPMP No.11457 of 2007 in WP No.8951 of 2007. CC No.1942 of 2015 came to be closed by order dated 11-04-2016, which reads thus:-

“This Contempt Case is filed alleging violation of the order, dated 02-07-2007 passed in WPMP No.11457 of 2007 in WP No.8951 of 2007. It is submitted by the learned Government Pleader for Revenue that the order dated 02-07-2007 has been complied with and the same is not disputed by Sri G. Vidya Sagar, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners. Hence, the contempt case is closed. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this contempt case shall stand closed. No costs.”

03. Be it noted that WP No.8951 of 2007, which is pending adjudication, was filed to declare the proceedings dated 12-12-2006 passed by the 1st respondent as illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional and to set aside the same. The case of the petitioner in the writ petition was by order dated 12-12-2006, mutation has taken place the revenue records under the RoR Act in favour of party respondents 3 to 44 in respect of the subject lands, which the petitioner assails on the ground that pattadar passbooks and title deeds in respect of the said lands have been issued long back in his favour, revenue entries could not have been made behind the back of the petitioners and without notice to them.

04. Be that as it may, Sri Satya Sai Trust for Learning represented by its managing trustee and another claims to be owners of the subject

lands in Sy.Nos.,812, 814 and 815 total extent Ac.23.32 $\frac{3}{4}$ guntas situated in Ankireddypalli village, Keesara mandal, Ranga Reddy district. The petitioner-party-in-person though admits that his name is entered in the revenue records in respect of 23.32 $\frac{3}{4}$, but his only grievance is sub-division numbers are added to the Sy.Nos.812, 814 and 815 in which the land in question is situated.

05. Counter affidavit filed by the 1st respondent-Tehsildar, Kesara tahsil, wherein it is stated that in the recent land records up-gradation programme-2018, necessary steps are taken and the rectification of records as per the directions of this Court have been carried out in accordance with memo no.A/2206/2013, dated 22-03-2016 in respect of the lands of the petitioner in question in Sy.Nos.812 (Ac.6-24), Sy.No.814 (Ac.14-27 $\frac{3}{4}$) and Sy.No.815 (Ac.2-21) total extent Ac.23-32 $\frac{3}{4}$ guntas and the same has been updated in the Dharani website (Online). A copy of the 1-B proceedings and Dharani online pahanies are filed along with the counter affidavit.

06. The learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue submits that the total extent of land as recorded in the revenue records is Ac.23-32 $\frac{3}{4}$ guntas is recorded in the name of the Sri Sathya Sai Trust for Learning represented by the petitioner and his wife. The petitioner-party-in-person submits that in his extent of land i.e. Ac.23-32 $\frac{3}{4}$ guntas there cannot be any sub-division of the survey nos. and said survey numbers, according to the party-in-person are to be recorded as Sy.Nos.812/A, 814/A and 815/A total extent Ac.23.32 $\frac{3}{4}$ guntas. But the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue states that the present sub-division of the survey numbers is on account of the up-gradation of the software and the name of the petitioners and extent is intact in the revenue records.

07. A perusal of the entries in the latest pahani produced by the learned Assistant Government Pleader Government in respect of the land in question goes to show that the name and extent claimed by the petitioners is intact except giving sub-division numbers to the survey numbers of the petitioners land, which the learned Assistant Government Pleader states is an offshoot of the up-gradation of the software *Dharani*.

08. In the light of the fact that the names of the petitioners are reflected in the revenue records and the extent claimed by the petitioners is intact, I do not see any willful and deliberate violation of the interim order passed by this Court. The contempt case is accordingly closed. However, if the petitioner-party-in-person still feels aggrieved by assigning the new sub-division nos. on account of up-gradation of software, it is open for them to take recourse to legal remedies as are available to them under law as main writ petition is still pending. Miscellaneous petitions if any pending shall also stand closed. No order as to costs.

A.RAJASHEKER REDDY, J

Dated: 28-06-2019
NRG

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

CC No.1139 of 2017

//WEB//

28-06-2019

NRG

