

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

W.P.No. 22907 of 2019

ORDER :

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

2. According to petitioner, an extent of land admeasuring Ac.2-20 guntas in Survey No.548 of Garidepally shivar of village and mandal, Suryapet district was assigned to his father late Narasimha vide Patta Certificate No.B1/1027/1976 dated 30.10.1976 and he was in possession and enjoyment of the said land and after the death of his father, petitioner came into possession and enjoyment. The revenue authorities issued pattadar passbook in favour of his father and his name was recorded in the pattadar and possessory column.

3. Petitioner states that to eke out his livelihood, he left for Bombay for some time while leasing out the subject land to one Banoth Saidamma. However, taking advantage of absence of petitioner, the said Banoth Saidamma got mutated her name in the revenue records as if the same belongs to her and later she got mutated the name of her son i.e. 4th respondent-Banoth Laghupathi in the revenue records.

4. It is further stated that the name of petitioner's father was recorded in pahanies for various years till 20.11.2012. Since the 4th respondent was not re-delivering possession of subject land, seeking restoration of possession, petitioner made representation dated 24.9.2018 to the District Collector and also reminder dated 5.8.2019, while marking copies to the Revenue Divisional Officer and the Tahsildar concerned. According to petitioner, though the District

Collector endorsed the Revenue Divisional Officer to enquire into the matter, so far no steps have been taken and possession is yet to be restored.

5. Since representations are made complaining of possession by third party in respect of assigned land, the writ petition is disposed of, directing the 3rd respondent-Tahsildar to look into the grievance of the petitioner as ventilated by him in his representations dated 24.9.2018 and 5.8.2019 and take appropriate action, as warranted by law, on the claim of the petitioner. It is made clear that there is no expression of opinion on the merits of the matter and it is always open to the 4th respondent to put-forth his case as and when notice is issued to him. As a sequel, the miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

Date: 17.12.2019
DA

P.NAVEEN RAO,J

