## THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO

## + CIVIL REVISION PETITION Nos.5092 and 5093 of 2014

- % Dated 19.08.2019
- # Bandaru Venkateshwarlu, S/o.Shambaiah, Aged: about 40 years, Occ: Busines and another

....Petitioners

## **VERSUS**

\$ Malgireddy Ram Reddy S/o.Nagi Reddy Aged: about 65 years, Occ: Agricultural, R/o.Nagireddygudem village, Nereducherla Mandal, Nalgonda District.

... Respondent

! Counsel for Petitioner : Sri V. Venugopala Rao

^ Counsel for Respondent : P. Rajasekhar

< GIST:

> HEAD NOTE:

? CITATIONS:

1. 2006 (6) ALD 136

## THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO <u>CIVIL REVISION PETITION Nos.5092 and 5093 of 2014</u> <u>COMMON ORDER:</u>

These two revisions arise out of orders passed in two suits in O.S.Nos.221 and 222 of 2009 of the Junior Civil Judge, Huzurnagar, directing that a document filed by the respondent be sent to the District Registrar of Stamps and Registration Department for impounding the same.

- 2. Sri V. Venugopala Rao, counsel for the petitioner, contends that under Section 33 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (for short, 'the Act'), the document can only be sent to the District Collector and not to the District Registrar of Stamps, Nalgonda District.
- 3. Sri Y.Chandrashekar, counsel appearing for Sri P.Rajasekhar, counsel for respondent, brought to the notice of the Court Notification No.G/5205/2016, dt.11.10.2016, issued by the Chief Controlling Revenue Authority and Commissioner and Inspector General, Registration and Stamps, delegating the powers of the District Collector under Sections 38 to 42 of the Act to District Registrar.
- 4. Though counsel for the petitioner sought to rely upon the judgment of the learned Single Judge reported in **G. Ramesh v. Revenue Divisional Officer, Nalgonda District**<sup>1</sup> to the effect that only the District Collector should take action under Section 33, 38 and 40 of the Act, at that point of time the circular, dt.11.10.2016, not being in existence, the said judgment has no relevance.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 2006 (6) ALD 136

- 5. I, therefore, do not find any merits in the revisions.
- 6. Accordingly, both the civil revision petitions are dismissed. No costs.

Miscellaneous Petitions pending, if any, in both the revisions, shall stand closed.

M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO, J

19<sup>th</sup> August 2019

L.R. Copy to be marked – Yes.

mar

