

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.27568 OF 2019

Date: 12.12.2019

Between:

Dornala Srihari S/o.Jayramulu,
Aged 68 yrs, Occu : Business,
R/o.H.No.2-9-91/5, Ganesh Street,
Jangaon Town and District.

.....Petitioner

And

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

.....Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.27568 OF 2019

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Revenue for respondents 1 to 4.

2. Petitioner challenges the notice, dated Nil October, 2019, wherein, by referring to an order stated to have been passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer, on 23.06.2019, he was called upon to explain why his name should not be removed from the revenue records on land to an extent of Ac.4-20 guntas in Sy.No.4 of Sripuram Village and Gram panchayat and to reflect the name of Vangala Indrasena Reddy. Petitioner claims to have filed explanation which was acknowledged by the Tahsildar Office on 21.10.2019.

3. A reading of the explanation would show that petitioner claims to have purchased the very same property in the year 2008 from Vangala Bugula reddy. It appears, so far no orders are passed. Petitioner is apprehending that Tahsildar is going to pass orders affecting his right.

4. As noticed above, the notice issued to petitioner is based on some order passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer. Therefore, it cannot be said that the notice was issued by incompetent authority and without jurisdiction. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition at this stage. It cannot be said that petitioner is remediless, if some adverse decision is made against him, pursuant to the notice impugned in the writ petition. Further if petitioner is aggrieved by the decision of Revenue Divisional

Officer, dated 23.06.2019, which is the basis for issuing impugned notice, he is entitled to work out his remedies as available in law.

5. Therefore, leaving it open to the petitioner to work out his remedies as available in law, the Writ petition is dismissed. Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

P.NAVEEN RAO, J

12th December, 2019
Rds

