

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.23767 OF 2019

Dated:31.10.2019

Between:

Smt. Annamma, W/o. Late Sleevaiah,
Aged 67 years, Occ: Housewife,
R/o.H.No.4-8-19, Manjeera Nagar,
Sangareddy, Sangareddy District

.. Petitioner

And

State of Telangana, rep., by 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.23767 OF 2019

ORDER:

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

2. According to petitioner, her husband Late Sleevaiah was an Ex-serviceman. Petitioner applied for assignment of land as wife of Ex-serviceman. According to her, on due consideration of her request, land to an extent of Acs.5.00 in Survey No.993/1 of Ameenpur Village was assigned. Thereafter, according to petitioner, there was supplementary Sethwar and Survey No.993 is now converted into Survey No.993/49 in the pahani for the year 2014 and in the revenue records, the same is not properly reflected. Therefore, petitioner made representation. Alleging that the representation made by the petitioner was not considered by the Tahsildar, Ameenpur Mandal, she filed W.P.No.10563 of 2017. By order dated 24.03.2017, the said Writ Petition was disposed of directing the Tahsildar to consider the representation of the petitioner and to take appropriate decision. In response to the directions issued by this Court, the Tahsildar considered the issue and passed orders on 15.05.2017 holding that no such patta was granted to the petitioner and file numbers mentioned in the patta certificate do not pertain to the subject property and therefore it is a fake and fabricated document.

3. Against the decision of the Tahsildar, remedy of appeal is provided under Section 158 of the Land Revenue Act. Without availing the said remedy and only on the ground that the

impugned order was passed, in view of the directions issued by this Court, the present Writ Petition is filed.

4. Since an effective and efficacious remedy of appeal is available against the decision of the Tahsildar, the Court is not inclined to entertain the Writ Petition.

5. Though learned counsel for the petitioner sought to contend that after the decision of the Tahsildar, information was obtained and the same would now disclose that the view expressed by the Tahsildar is not correct, this aspect can also be agitated before the Revenue Divisional Officer in an appeal and the Revenue Divisional Officer may be in a better position to take a decision on verification of records, if what is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner is correct.

6. The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed leaving it open to the petitioner to avail the remedy of appeal. Miscellaneous applications, if any, pending shall stand closed.

Date:31.10.2019

KH

P.NAVEEN RAO, J