

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.21265 OF 2019

Dated:19.12.2019

Between:

Mandala Ravinder Reddy, S/o. M. Papi
Reddy, aged about 50 years, Occ: Business,
R/o.Plot No.53, Road No.13, Ravinder
Nagar Colony, Sai Baba Temple, Habsiguda,
Secunderabad .. 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.21265 OF 2019

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Revenue for respondents 1 to 4. With consent, the Writ Petition is disposed of.

2. Petitioner herein is the respondent in the revision bearing No.F2/2095/2019 pending before the Joint Collector, Yadadri Bhongir District. In this Writ Petition, petitioner challenges the interlocutory order granted by the Joint Collector on 22.08.2019. The operative portion of the said order reads as under:

“... Matter has been examined and the court has opined that there are sufficient grounds to stay the matter. Therefore, stay is granted until further orders with a direction not to change or alienate or create any charges on the schedule lands till disposal of the revision against the respondents 1 to 5.”

3. The revision petitioner is respondent No.5 herein. The revision was preferred against the orders of the Tahsildar, Bibinagar Mandal, Bhongir District, dated 26.10.2007 and 06.09.2007 in respect of land to an extent of Acs.11.35 guntas in Survey Nos.570 and 571 of Kondamadugu Village, Bibinagar Mandal, Yadadri Bhongir District. These orders of 2007, according to petitioner, were passed in favour of the vendors to the vendors of the petitioner.

4. The only submission made by learned counsel for the petitioner, at this stage, is on the ground that having regard to the fact that after 12 years of the order of Tahsildar, revision was directly preferred. The Joint Collector, Yadadri Bhongir District, ought not to

have passed interlocutory orders, more so without giving any opportunity of hearing.

5. From a reading of the order, dated 22.08.2019, passed by the Joint Collector, extracted above, it appears that no hearing was afforded to the petitioner before passing the order.

6. Having regard to the fact that revision was preferred after 12 years, this Court, by order dated 01.10.2019 suspended the order of the Joint Collector, dated 22.08.2019, initially for a period of four weeks and was extended subsequently on 07.11.2019. While suspending the order, the Court also observed that the development process would go on in accordance with the sanctioned plan. Praying to vacate the said interim order, I.A.No.2 of 2019 is filed by respondent No.5. Learned counsel for the 5th respondent does not dispute that the revision was preferred after 12 years, but justifies preferring revision.

7. The Court is not expressing opinion on maintainability of revision and claim of the 5th respondent. Having regard to the interim orders earlier passed and the fact that revision was preferred against the orders of the Tahsildar, which were of the year 2007, in the facts of this case, I am of the opinion that while directing the revisional authority to conclude the proceedings expeditiously, the earlier interim order of this Court passed on 01.10.2019 shall continue.

8. Therefore, the Writ Petition is disposed of directing the Joint Collector, Yadadri Bhongir District, to pass orders on the revision filed by respondent No.5 as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy

of this order, by affording due opportunity to the respective parties. The interim order granted by this Court on 01.10.2019 shall continue till a decision is made by the Joint Collector, as directed above. Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

Date:19.12.2019

KH

