

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 17039 of 2019

Date : 9.8.2019

Between:

Pambala Erraiah S/o Posham aged 49 years Occ Business
R/o Post Sri Rampur H No 6-350 Krishna colony,
Manchiryala Mandal District

.....Petitioner

And

The State of Telangana
rep by Principal Secretary For Revenue,
Secretarate, Saifabad Hyderabad & others

.....Respondents



The Court made the following:

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 17039 of 2019

ORAL ORDER:

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

2. Petitioner claims to be purchaser of open land to an extent of 241.16 sq yards in Survey No. 229, Mancherial revenue village and mandal, which is now a district, vide registered sale deed dated 30.1.2010 from one Vimal Kumari Kamle and Jayasree Kamle. Petitioner contends that his vendor purchased the said property through registered sale deed dated 28.1.1998 from Kareem, Abdul Razak, Abdul Gaffar and Aleema represented by guardian Smt Noorjahan Begum. Petitioner alleges that his vendor's name was mutated in the revenue records; that he entered into agreement of sale on 29.11.2009 and sale was concluded and sale deed was executed on 30.1.2010. In this writ petition, petitioner is challenging the orders of Tahsildar dated 12.8.2009. By the said orders, Tahsildar ordered mutation of name of Venishetty Raghavendar in place of Tippani Shiva Prasad. Said mutation is based on the registered sale transaction dated 24.3.2009 earlier in point of time to that of petitioner.

3. Be that as it may, even assuming that the vendor of petitioner had valid title but by the time sale deed was registered in the Revenue records, name of Sri Venishetty Raghavendar was shown, therefore, petitioner cannot claim that such mutation transaction ought to have been informed to him and he should have been put on notice. Such question does not arise as he was not in picture by then and sale

transaction took place finally on 30.1.2010 only. Further more, no reasons are stated by petitioner to challenge order dated 12.8.2009 at this distance of time. Therefore, Court is not entertaining the writ petition and accordingly, the same is dismissed. Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, are closed.

P NAVEEN RAO,J

DATE: 9-8-2019
TVK

