

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

MAIN CASE No.: W.P.No.29647 of 2023

PROCEEDING SHEET

S. No	DATE	ORDER	
1.	16.11.2023	<u>RC, J</u> <u>W.P.No.29647 of 2023</u> Notice before admission. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue takes notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 4. Sri V.Dushyanth Reddy, learned counsel takes notice on behalf of the caveator/5th respondent. For respective counters, post on 05.12.2023. <u>RC, J</u> <u>I.A.No.1 OF 2023</u> Heard Sri M.Venkata Ramana Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri E.Kumar, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue and Sri V.Dushyanth Reddy, learned counsel for the caveator/5th respondent. Learned counsel for the petitioner, in elaboration to what has been stated in the affidavit contended that, DKT patta has been granted in favour of the petitioner's father in the year 1970 and after his demise, during partition, an extent of Ac.5.27 cents in S.No.239/2 of Sampathikota	

		Revenue was devolved upon the petitioner and accordingly pattadar passbook was also issued in favour of the petitioner by revenue authorities. He further submitted that, the unofficial respondent preferred an appeal before the 3rd respondent against the issuance of pattadar passbook in favour of the petitioner and the 3rd respondent, without jurisdiction has entertained the same, in spite of raising objections to the said effect by the petitioner and passed order dated 24.08.2022. Aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner preferred Revision before the 2nd respondent-Joint Collector and the 2nd respondent has dismissed the Revision <i>vide</i> order dated 06.10.2023. He further contended that taking advantage of the orders of the 3rd and 2nd respondents, 4th respondent-Tahsildar is contemplating to mutate the name of the unofficial respondent with respect to the subject property. If the same is allowed to happen, the petitioner's rights will be affected and the purpose of filing the Writ petition will be defeated. As such, prayed to pass appropriate orders to protect the interest of the petitioner. On the other hand, Sri V.Dushyanth Reddy, learned counsel for the Caveator/5th respondent contended that, yesterday itself only, the revenue authorities have mutated the name of 5th respondent in the revenue records. As such, no interim orders can be passed at this stage, however sought time to file counter.	
--	--	---	--

		Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue sought time to file a detailed counter. Perused the record. The documents that are filed by the petitioner in support of his claim show that the petitioner is in possession of the subject property and <i>prima faice</i> the petitioner has made out a point for consideration in the present Writ Petition. However, taking the submissions of both the learned counsel into consideration, to strike the balance between the parties, this Court is inclined to pass the following order. <i>Status Quo</i> shall be maintained with regard to the subject property, pending further orders. MP RC, J	
--	--	---	--

--	--	--	--