APHC010263042026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE 30th DAY OF JUNE 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 13693 OF 2026

Between:

1. CHAPPA APPALANAIDU, S/o Suribabu, Aged about 50 years, Hindu, Resident of Seethanna Agraharam Village, Makavarapalem Mandal, Anakapalli District.

...Petitioner

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, Rep. By its Principal Secretary, Panchayat Raj Departments, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi, Amaravati.522237

2. Seethanngaram Gram Panchayat, Rep. by its Panchayat Secretary, Seethanagaram, Makavarapalem Mandal, Anakapalli District, Andhra Pradesh

3. Sappa Demudu, S/o not known to the petitioner. Aged about 42 years Resident of Seethanna Agraharam Village, Makavarapalem Mandal, Anakapalli District. 531113

4. Palla Chinnabbai, S/o not known to the petitioner, Aged about 35 years Resident of Seethanna Agraharam Village, Makavarapalem Mandal, Anakapalli District. 531113

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner: P NANILU NAIDU

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV
Counsel for the Respondents:HARSHITHA G. S.

The Court made the following order:

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel for Gram Panchayat.

It is the case of the petitioner that he is the owner and possessor of a parcel of land admeasuring approximately Ac.0.10 ¼ cents in Sy.No.25-1-A situated at Seethanna Agraharam, Makavarapalem Mandal, Anakapalli District, there is a pathway measuring 10.05 feet in width in existence since time immemorial, providing access to the petitioner's property and the same is confirmed during the recent re-survey conducted by the authorities. It is his further case that the unofficial respondent Nos.3 and 4 own properties which are located directly in front of the petitioner's land and that the said respondents commenced construction of a house without obtaining any approved building plan or layout permission from the Gram Panchayat, thereby encroaching and amalgamating 10.5 foot wide pathway into their proposed building structure.

It is the grievance of the petitioner that if once the said pathway is permanently blocked and built upon, there will be no alternative route to the petitioner's property.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the unofficial respondents are continuing the illegal construction activity at a rapid pace and if they complete the construction, there will be no alternative route to the petitioner's property. Hence, the Writ Petition. It is his grievance that the petitioner submitted the representation dated 23.04.2026 to 2nd respondent in this regard, but no action has been taken by 2nd respondent on the said representation.

Considering the submissions made by the counsel and in view of the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court directs the respondent-authorities to dispose of the representation of the petitioner dated 23.04.2026 within four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this Order.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of. No order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the Writ Petition shall stand closed.

_____

JUSTICE K. SREENIVASA REDDY

Dt: 30.06.2026
JKS

Whether the order is:

Speaking		Reasoned	☑
Reportable		Non-reportable	☑

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 13693 of 2026

30.06.2026

JKS