

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.19989 OF 2019

Dated:19.12.2019

Between:

Korsa Venkat Ratnam, W/o. Late Bhadraiah,
Aged about 49 years, Occ: Home Maker,
R/o. Peddarlagudem Village, Dummugudem
Mandal, Bhadradi Kothagudem District .. Petitioner

And

The State of Telangana, rep., its
Principal Secretary, Revenue Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others .. Respondents



This Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.19989 OF 2019

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Revenue for respondents 1 to 3.

2. Petitioner claims that she along with her husband are the owners of land to an extent of Acs.0.3840 guntas Survey No.159/7, Ac.0.2600 guntas in Survey No.2115/2b and Acs.3.32 guntas in Survey No.196/1a of Peddarlagudem Village, Dummugudem Mandal, Bhadradri Kothagudem District. They were blessed with one daughter. Petitioner now contends that believing the words of respondent No.4, the person employed by them as servant, the land was transferred in his name. At that stage, respondent No.4 assured that he would take care of the petitioner and her husband. However, at the time of death of petitioner's husband and her mother-in-law, respondent No.4 did not look after the affairs, did not attend to the cremation formalities and is not taking care of the family. Petitioner therefore requested the District Collector, Kothagudem, Bhadradri Kothagudem District, by a representation, dated 26.07.2019, to cancel the patta granted in the name of respondent No.4.

3. As the averments in the representation would disclose that voluntarily petitioner and her husband transferred the property in the name of respondent No.4. If any promise was made at the time of transfer of property and that was not fulfilled, petitioner may be entitled to seek appropriate remedy. Therefore, it is open to the petitioner to work out her remedies in civil law, but the District

Collector cannot go into the issue as to whether the person flouted the undertaking given by him or a promise made at the time of transfer of property. Therefore, the prayer sought in the Writ Petition cannot be granted, as no such representation is maintainable and no such exercise can be undertaken by the revenue authorities.

4. The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed granting liberty to the petitioner to work out her remedies in accordance with law. Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

Date:19.12.2019

KH

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

