APHC010436112026

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

TUESDAY, THE 27th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 23694 and 27337 / 2026

WRIT PETITION NO: 23694 2026

Between:

1. PEDDIREDDY VIJAYA LAKSHMI, W/O PEDDIREDDY GOPALA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 80 YEARS, OCC. HOUSEHOLD, R/O D.NO.12-455/3/1A, KRISHNA NAGAR, TADEPALLI, GUNTUR DISTRICT - 522501.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, REVENUE (LANDS) DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.PIN. 522238
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, GUNTUR DISTRICT, GUNTUR.PIN. 522004
3. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER/SUBCOLLECTOR, TENALI DIVISION, TENALI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.PIN. 522201
4. THE TAHSILDAR, TADEPALLI MANDAL, GUNTUR DISTRICT.PIN. 522501

5. STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.PIN.522238

6. THE COMMISSIONER, ANDHRA PRADESH CAPITAL REGION DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, VIJAYAWADA.PIN. 520002

7. THE COMMISSIONER, MANGALAGIRI TADEPALLI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, MANGALAGIRI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.PIN.522503

...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 of Mandamus declaring the inaction of the respondents in failing to recognise and record the conversion of the petitioner's land admeasuring Ac.0.53 cents in original Survey No.124/1 of Tadepalli Village and Mandal, presently subdivided as Survey Nos.124/1B and 124/10, despite payment of conversion tax of Z1,85,500/- under Challan No.81264755672024 dated 03.10.2024 and submission of Application No.NLCR250122066933 dated 22.01.2025, as illegal, arbitrary and contrary to Sections 3 and 4 of the Andhra Pradesh Agricultural Land (Conversion for Non- Agricultural Purposes) Act, 2006, Rules 3, 4 and 7 of the Rules, 2018, as amended by G.O.Ms.No.227 dated 26.08.2021, and Section 3 of Act No.20 of 2025 and consequently declare that the land stood converted upon payment of the requisite tax without necessity of any separate conversion order, and direct the respondents to record the conversion against Survey Nos.124/1B and 124/1C in Webland, Record of Rights, Adangal and all connected revenue records and furnish the updated entries to the petitioner or alternatively, dispose of the petitioner's application under the law prevailing prior to repeal

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 Writ Petition, to direct the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 28.07.2026, with reference to Challan No.81264755672024 dated 03.10.2024 and Application No.NLCR250122066933 dated 22.01.2025, and take appropriate action in accordance with Rules 3, 4 and 7 of the Rules, 2018, as amended by G.O.Ms.No.227 dated 26.08.2021, within a time stipulated by this Hon'ble Court, without insisting upon a separate conversion order

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. KARUMANCHI INDRANEEL BABU

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR REVENUE
2. A S C BOSE (SC FOR MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS AP)
3. S PRANATHI
4. GP MUNCIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

WRIT PETITION NO: 27337/2026

Between:

1. PEDDIREDDY VIJAYA LAKSHMI, W/O PEDDIREDDY GOPALA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 80 YEARS, OCC HOUSEWIFE, R/O D.NO.12-455/3/1A, KRISHNA NAGAR, TADEPALLI, GUNTUR DISTRICT-522501

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, , REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, REVENUE (LANDS) DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, PIN 522238.

2. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, PIN 522238.
3. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, , GUNTUR DISTRICT, GUNTUR, PIN 522004.
4. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER/SUBCOLLECTOR, TENALI DIVISION, TENALI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, PIN 522201.
5. THE TAHSILDAR, TADEPALLI MANDAL, GUNTUR DISTRICT, PIN 522501.
6. THE ANDHRA PRADESH CAPITAL REGION DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, THROUGH ITS COMMISSIONER, VIJAYAWADA, PIN 520002.
7. THE MANGALAGIRI TADEPALLI MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, THROUGH ITS COMMISSIONER, MANGALAGIRI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, 522503.

...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 toto issue an appropriate Writ, Order or Direction, more particularly one in the nature of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the entire records relating to Application No.NLCR250122066933, including the report of the fourth respondent the alleged rejection/order dated 12.02.2025, if any and the proceedings in Rc.No. 1046/2026-G dated 15.09.2026 issued by the third respondent and quash the same for being illegal, arbitrary. without jurisdiction, uncommunicated, violative of the principles of natural justice and contrary to Sections 3 and 5 of the Andhra Pradesh Agricultural Land (Conversion for Non-Agricultural Purposes) Act, 2006 and consequently declare that the land admeasuring Ac.0.53 cents in original Survey No. 124/1, presently subdivided as Survey Nos. 124/IB and 124/1C of Tadepalli Village

and Mandal, stood converted upon payment of the prescribed conversion tax and submission of the statutory intimation

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 Writ Petition, to suspend the operation and all adverse consequences of Rc.No.1046/2026-G dated 15.09.2026 and of the alleged rejection/order dated 12.02.2025,

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. KARUMANCHI INDRANEEL BABU

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR REVENUE
2. A S C BOSE (SC FOR MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS AP)
3. GP MUNCIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

The Court made the following common order:

Heard Sri Karumanchi Indraneel Babu, learned counsel for the petitioner; Sri Krishna Reddy, learned Government Pleader for Revenue, for respondents 1 to 4; learned Government Pleader for Municipal Administration and Urban Development, for respondent No.2; Smt. S. Pranathi, learned standing counsel for CRDA, for respondent No. 6, and Sri ASC Bose, learned standing counsel for respondent No.7.

2. Since the issues in both writ petitions are interconnected, this order disposes of them together.

3. **W.P.No.23694 of 2026** is filed to declare the inaction of respondent No.4 in processing the application No.NLCR250122066933, dated 22.01.2025

made by the petitioner for conversion of land to an extent of Ac.0-53 cents in the original Survey No.124/1, sub-divided as Survey Nos.124/B and 124/1C, Tadepalli Village and Mandal, despite the payment of conversion taxes of Rs.1,85,500/- vide challan No.81264755672024, dated 03.10.2024, as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Sections 3 and 4 of the Andhra Pradesh Agricultural Land (Conversion for Non-Agricultural Purposes) Act, 2006 and the Rules made thereunder.

4. On 20.08.2026, an interim order was passed in the said writ petition, directing respondent No.3 to consider the application made by the petitioner vide No.NLCR250122066933, dated 22.01.2025-Ex.P6.

5. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tenali, pursuant to the interim order, dated 20.08.2026, issued an endorsement vide Rc.No.1046/2026-G, dated 15.09.2026, stating that the application made by the petitioner was already rejected on 12.02.2025, based on the report submitted by the Tahsildar, Tadepalli, as the applicant failed to submit the link document to establish the title flow from the purchasers.

6. Thereafter, the petitioner filed **W.P.No.27337 of 2026** to call for the entire records relating to application No.NLCR250122066933, including the report of the Revenue Divisional Officer, the rejection order dated 12.02.2025 and the endorsement issued vide Rc.No.1046/2026-G, dated 15.09.2026 (hereinafter referred to as the ‘endorsement-Ex.P11’).

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that, except for the endorsement-Ex.P11, no detailed order rejecting the petitioner’s application was furnished to the petitioner. Even the instructions produced by the learned Government Pleader do not disclose the passing of a detailed, speaking order

rejecting the petitioner's application for conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural land, as referred to supra.

8. Learned Government Pleader for Revenue would submit that the application, dated 22.01.2025, made by the petitioner, was rejected on 12.02.2025 (13.02.2025 as per the office note), by the then Sub-Collector, Tenali. Learned Government Pleader produced a copy of the office note regarding rejection of the petitioner’s application. The learned Government Pleader submitted that the order is not available in the authority's office.

9. A perusal of the office note produced before this Court discloses that the Sub-Collector, Tenali, rejected the petitioner’s application for conversion, based on the recommendations made by the Tahsildar. The endorsement issued by the Revenue Divisional Officer also discloses that the Sub-Collector, Tenali, rejected the petitioner’s application. However, no reasons are forthcoming, except that the authority acted on the Tahsildar's report.

10. It is a settled principle of law that reasoning is the heartbeat of every order. The quasi-judicial authority must consider the parties' contentions. If the authority does not accept them, there should be a finding to that effect. The reasons recorded by the authority disclose the mental process by which the decision has been reached and demonstrate that the matter has received due and thoughtful consideration. The reasons assure the parties that the authority has considered their submissions and promote transparency in the administration of justice. The reasons further facilitate appellate or supervisory review by helping courts understand the order. Reasons safeguard against arbitrariness by ensuring that conclusions are grounded in legal principles and evidence rather than mere subjective opinion. Failing to record reasons can

lead to dual infirmities: first, it may prejudice the affected party; and second, more importantly, it can hamper the proper administration of justice. Therefore, recording clear, cogent reasons is an indispensable component of the rule of law. See **S.N.Mukherjee v. Union of India**[1]**.**

11. In the case at hand, as stated supra, as per the endorsement-Ex.P11 and the office note produced by the learned Government Pleader for Revenue, the petitioner's application was rejected based on the recommendations made by the Tahsildar and the said rejection order is not available in the office of the authority. Since neither the office note nor the endorsement reflects the reasons for rejecting the application, the rejection does not withstand legal scrutiny, and such an order needs to be interdicted.

12. Given the discussion supra, the rejection order, dated 13.02.2025, passed by the Sub-Collector, is hereby set aside; the matter is remanded to the Sub-Collector, Tenali. The application made by the petitioner is re-opened. The authority shall consider the application, dated 22.01.2025 made by the petitioner vis-à-vis conversion of the land to an extent of Ac.0-53 cents in original Survey No.124/1, sub-divided as Survey Nos.124/B and 124/1C, Tadepalli Village and Mandal, afresh. The authority shall consider the amount of Rs.1,85,500/- paid by the petitioner vide challan No.81264755672024, dated 03.10.2024.

13. At this juncture, learned Government Pleader submitted that sometimes, software may not accept old applications and, in such a case, the petitioner has to make a fresh application.

---

[1] 1990(4) SCC 594

14. In view of the above submission, it is made clear that if the petitioner is required to make a fresh application, the same shall be numbered treating it as filed on 22.01.2025 and the amount of Rs.1,85,500/- already paid by the petitioner shall be adjusted.

15. With the above directions, these writ petitions are disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

Date: 27.10.2026
IKN