APHC010356712026

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

MONDAY, THE 2nd DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 20344/2026**

**Between:**

1. BATHULA VARA PRASAD, S/O. LATE BATHULA VENAKATAIAH, AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS, R/O ANKIREDDIPALLI, KOLIMIGUNDIA, KURNOOL-518123.

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI.522238
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT.516001
3. THE TAHSILDAR, KONDAPURAM MANDAL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT. 516001
4. SATTIBAYANNA GARI GAUTHAM REDDY, S/O. SHIVA SANKAR REDDY, AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS, OCC PRIVATE EMPLOYEE, R/O. T.KONDURU VILLAGE, KONDAPURAM MANDAL YSR KADAPA DISTRICT. 516444

**...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 It is also further prayed that this Honble Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ, Order or Direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the 3rd respondent in not considering and disposing of the petitioners representation despite issuing notice and conducting enquiry on 27.10.2025, and in permitting/continuing the

mutation of the revenue records without following the mandatory procedure of law and without passing a reasoned order after due enquiry, as illegal, arbitrary, violative of the principles of natural justice and Articles 14 and 300-A of the Constitution of India, and consequently direct the 3rd respondent to consider the petitioner's representation, conduct proceedings strictly in accordance with law, pass a reasoned order after affording due opportunity to all affected parties, and restore the petitioner's revenue entries if found entitled, and 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 Pending disposal of the above Writ Petition, it is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble court may be pleased to direct the respondents especially the 3"*^ respondent not to effect any further mutation alteration or change in the revenue records in respect of the lands in Murugampalli Village, Kondapuram Mandal, YSR Kadapa District, bearing Sy.No.62/1 admeasuring Ac.2.64 cents and Sy.No.29/2 admeasuring Ac.2.79 cents and to treat the said Survey numbers as disputed lands pending disposal of the writ petition and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1. S SRAVANA SANDHYA

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1. GP FOR REVENUE

**The Court made the following order:**

Heard Smt. S. Sravana Sandhya, learned counsel for the petitioner; and Sri Chandra Sekhar, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, for respondents 1 to 3. Notice in respect of the 4th respondent is dispensed with, as no order has been passed affecting his rights or interests.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner owns an extent of Ac.3.53 cents in Sy.No.54/1; Ac.2.79 cents in Sy.No.29/2 and Ac.2.64 cents in Sy.No.62/1 of Murugampalli Village, Kondapuram Mandal, YSR Kadapa District. One Purushottam Reddy interfered with possession of the said extent, claiming that the petitioner’s father had sold the property.

Upon verification of online revenue records, the petitioner found that the 4th respondent's name had been mutated in the Record of Rights. The petitioner made a representation to the 3rd respondent. The 3rd respondent issued a notice dated 27.10.2025, directing the petitioner and the 4th respondent to appear for an enquiry. However, the 3rd respondent failed to pass any order.

3. Initially, the writ petition was listed on 17.08.2026 and adjourned at the request of the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, to get the instructions from the Tahsildar – 3rd respondent, regarding the enquiry pursuant to the notice dated 10.10.2025 (Ex.P1).

4. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue submitted the instructions of the 3rd respondent.

5. As seen from the instructions, there is no dispute regarding the petitioner’s representation dated 08.09.2025 to the 3rd respondent. The 3rd respondent, in fact, conducted an enquiry and issued notices to the petitioner and the 4th respondent. During the enquiry, both parties stated that the dispute relating to the title of the subject lands must be adjudicated by the competent Civil Court. However, neither the petitioner nor the 4th respondent submitted any written statement or supporting evidence before the authority. No endorsement or final order has been issued by the authority on the representation.

6. The instructions would further indicate that the 4th respondent is in possession of Ac.2.64 cents in Sy.No.62/1, Ac.2.79 cents in Sy.No.29/2 and Ac.3.53 cents in Sy.No.54/1 of Muragampalli Village, Kondapuram Mandal. Column No.15 of the revenue records indicates the purchase. The petitioner did not disclose all the facts and filed the above writ petition. The subject land was classified as “Patta” land as per the Fair Land Register of Muragampalli Village, Kondapuram Mandal. The instructions of the 3rd respondent are made part of the record.

7. In reply, counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not provided an opportunity and, in fact, the petitioner should be afforded an opportunity.

8. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, without going into the merits or any other disputed questions of the matter, the writ petition is disposed of, at the stage of admission, with the consent of both the learned counsel. In fact, as seen from the instructions, the authority conducted an enquiry; however, it has not passed any order.

9. However, in view of the dispute regarding the enquiry, without going into those aspects, the petitioner and the 4th respondent shall approach the 3rd respondent with the relevant records. After conducting an enquiry, the learned 3rd respondent shall issue an appropriate endorsement strictly as per the Rules, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within six (06) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

**JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI**

Date: 02.11.2026
SNI

**175**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 20344 OF 2026**

Date: 02.11.2026
SNI