APHC010466322026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3331]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE 15th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 25539/2026

Between:

1. PULI KRISHNA, S/O JAGANNADHAM, AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS, AGRICULTURE, RIO KOTHAPALEM VILLAGE, VETAPALEM MANDAL, BAPATLA DISTRICT

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETERIAT BUILDING AMARAVATI. 522-2-9

2. THE JOINT COLLECTOR, BAPATLA DISTRICT, BAPATLA.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Manadamus declaring the inaction of the 2nd Respondent in passing the orders in Revision perition No.Rc.D2/2995/2011 filed against the order vide D.Dis.C/3852/2010 dt.25.08.2011 filed by the Petitioner is illegal, arbitrary, capricious, unjust and violative of Articles 14, 21 and 300A of Constitution of India. Consequently, direct the 2nd Respondent to pass orders in the Revision Petition filed by the Petitioner by forthiiih within a stipulated time and to pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased

direct the 2nd Respondent to pass orders in the Revision Petition No.Rc.D2/2995/2011 filed by the Petitioner by forthwith within a stipulated time pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. N A RAMACHANDRA MURTHY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following:

ORDER

Heard Sri N.A.Ramachandra Murthy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Divya Teja, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, for the respondents.

2. The above writ petition is filed to declare the inaction of the 2nd respondent in passing the orders in Revision Petition No.Rc.D2/2955/2011 filed against the order vide D.Dis.C/3852/2010, dated 25.08.2011, filed by the petitioner, as illegal and arbitrary.

3. Sri Divya Teja, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, submitted the written instructions of the 2nd respondent-Joint Collector, wherein it was stated thus:

> "It is further submitted that, the then Joint Collector, Prakasam District had taken a Revision Petition vide Rc.D2/2995/2011 on 05.11.2011. Several Notices were also issued and several hearing and arguments were also conducted. The Petitioner had not submitted any relevant documents during hearing while asking the proof of documents to the petitioner, the petitioner oftenly taken adjournments to submit the proofs. After district bifurcation, this file was transferred to Bapatla District. This Revision Petition was taken on file and hearing were also conducted vide Rc.B6/2487/2023, dated 22.07.2023 in the

newly formed District. … … During the hearing conducted on 28.03.2026, both parties requested to survey the above said land. Accordingly, the Joint Collector (2nd respondent), Bapatla instructed the Tahsildar, Vetapalem to survey the above said lands and directed to report compliance within 15 days. The report from the Tahsildar, Vetapalem is awaited. The Tahsildar, Vetapalem is engaged busy work with Census and Special Intensive Revision (SIR, 2026). Neither the petitioner nor the respondent in this case were being attended the survey work while notices were given to them for survey and any of them were not approached the Tahsildar, Vetapalem for survey.

The Revision Petition is under enquiry and it will be disposed as expeditiously as possible and the orders will be communicated to the petitioner within a short period."

4. Given the written instructions of 2nd respondent-Joint Collector, keeping the writ petition pending and inviting a counter will not serve any purpose.

5. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of at the admission stage, with the consent of learned counsel on either side, directing the learned 2nd respondent to dispose of the revision (Ex.P1), by giving an opportunity of hearing to both parties and pass appropriate orders as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No order as to costs.

As a sequel, all the pending miscellaneous applications shall stand closed.

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

PVD