
(2000) 08 AP CK 0071

In the Andhra Pradesh High Court

Case No : Writ Petition No. 1462 of 2000

Dendu Venkata Ramanaiah

APPELLANT

Vs

Mandal Revenue Officer

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 24-08-2000

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 226

Citation : (2000) 5 ALT 556

Hon'ble Judges : B. Sudershan Reddy, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : T.C. Krishnan, for the Appellant; Govt. Pleader, for the Respondent

Judgement

B. Sudershan Reddy, J.—Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Revenue.

2. As rightly contended by the learned Counsel for the petitioner, the Mandal Revenue Officer has no authority or jurisdiction in law to interfere in any manner whatsoever to resolve any civil dispute. The law does not permit the Mandal Revenue Officer to resolve any such civil disputes even with noble intention to resolve the same. The Mandal Revenue Officer can exercise only such jurisdiction and power vested in him by or under the law.

3. Admittedly, in the present case, there appears to be a serious civil dispute between the petitioner and one G. Laxmi Reddy, which is the subject matter of O.S. No. 340 of 1999 on the file of the learned Junior Civil Judge, Kovur. Evidently, the Mandal Revenue Officer cannot interfere to resolve any dispute, which may touch or have bearing upon the subject matter of the suit in O.S. No. 340 of 1999.

4. However, in the counter-affidavit, the Mandai Revenue Officer states that having received the notice from the learned Counsel for the petitioner, he has stopped the further proceedings.

5. In such view of the matter, no further directions as such are required to be issued in this writ petition except to make the statement made by the Mandal Revenue Officer on oath as a part of the record.

6. The Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of No order as to costs.