

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.24839 OF 2019

Date: 03.12.2019

Between:

Dr. Vijayalaxmi D/o.Sri Chinta Govind Reddy,
Aged about 77 yrs, R/o.H.No.1258,
Road No.12, Banjara Hills,
Hyderabad 500 034
Rep., by her GPA
Dr.B.Ranganatha Reddy,
S/o.B.Jogi Reddy,
Aged about 68 yrs, Occu : Professor ENT (Retd.),
R/o.H.No.1258, Road No.12,
Banjara Hills, Hyderabad 500 034

.....Petitioner

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep., by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad, T.S. & others.

.....Respondents

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.24839 OF 2019

ORDER:

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

2. According to the deponent who is the General Power of Attorney holder of petitioner, petitioner and her mother jointly purchased residential plot bearing No.290, Block No.10 part in Sy.Nos.169, 170, 171, 175 and 176, admeasuring 600 Square yards at Lahari Estate, Bachupally Village Qutubullapur Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, vide document No.1993/1993 dated 31.01.1993. Petitioner's mother died on 13.09.1994. According to the petitioner after the death of her mother, she succeeded to the entire extent of land. Petitioner claims to be ordinarily residing in San Antonio, USA and when she recently came down to India with an intention to undertake construction of building, she was informed that the subject property was acquired by the revenue authorities. As no details are available, petitioner made representation to furnish details of acquisition. But so far, no details are furnished. Hence, this writ petition.

3. The averments in the affidavit filed in support of writ petition and the representation made by the petitioner would disclose that petitioner is in possession and enjoyment of the property and according to her, the property was not acquired by either the revenue authorities or by the Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation. When petitioner intends to apply for building permission, she was orally informed of the alleged acquisition. However, no details are furnished. Petitioner also

filed W.P.No.17959 of 2019 praying to declare the action of Revenue Divisional Officer in not paying compensation to the petitioner and not considering and disposing of the representation. This Court having noticed that no details are furnished with reference to the acquisition and non payment of compensation, the Writ Petition was dismissed with liberty to apply for all the details of acquisition.

4. As petitioner asserts that she is in possession and enjoyment, no acquisition was made and no compensation was paid, nothing prevented her, from making application for grant of building permission. Apparently, so far petitioner has not applied for building permission, but only makes an oral assertion that some person of GHMC informed about alleged acquisition.

5. Thus, granting liberty to the petitioner to make application for grant of building permission, if so advised, and to work out her remedies, with reference to the alleged claim of non payment of compensation, if at all the land was acquired, the Writ Petition is disposed of. Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

P.NAVEEN RAO, J

3rd December, 2019
Rds