+ APHC010448712023

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI [3332]
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

TUESDAY, THE 6th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT:THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

WRIT PETITION NO: 23322/2023

Between:

1. TULIMELLI KUTUMBA RAO, S/O. TIRUPATAYYA, AGED ABOUT 60 YEARS, OCC. AGRICULTURE, R/O. ERRAGUNTAPALLI VILLAGE, CHINTALAPUDI MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT, PREVIOUSLY WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR AND DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, , ELURU DISTRICT, ELURU.
3. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, NUZIVD DIVISION, ELURU DISTRICT.
4. THE TAHSILDAR, CHINTALAPUDI MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT.

...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 Mandamus declaring the action of Respondents No. 2 to 4 in not considering petitioner's representations dated 08-05-2023, 25-10-2021 and

25-11-2021 and not mutating the name of the petitioner in the revenue records and not issuing pattadar passbooks to the petitioner for his land in an extent of Ac. 0-81 cents in R.S. No. 561/2 and Ac. 1-53 cents in R.S. No. 562/5, total admeasuring Ac. 2-34 cents, situated in Erraguntlapalle village, Chintalapudi Mandal, Eluru District, in pursuance of D-Form patta issued to the petitioner in L.D. No. 473/B-96, dated 07-07-1986, by the Respondent No. 4 as being illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional and contrary to POT Act, Rules and Revenue Laws and consequently direct Respondents to mutate the name of the petitioner in the revenue records and issue pattadar passbooks for his land in an extent of Ac. 0-81 cents in R.S. No. 561/2 and Ac. 1-53 cents in R.S. No. 562/5, total admeasuring Ac. 2-34 cents, situated in Erraguntlapalle village, Chintalapudi Mandal, Eluru District, in pursuance of D-Form patta issued to the petitioner in L.D. No. 473/B-96, dated 07-07-1986, by Respondent No. 4 and to pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2023

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 to direct the Respondents to consider petitioner's representations dated 08-05-2023, 25-10-2021 and 25-11-2021 forthwith pending disposal of the above writ petition

IA NO: 2 OF 2023

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 to implead the proposed respondent No.6 & 7 herein as respondent No 6 & 7 in W.P. No.23322 of 2023 and I.A. No.1 of 2023 and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. G RAJENDRA BABU

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR REVENUE

ORDER

The Writ Petition is filed questioning the inaction of the respondent nos. 2 to 4 in considering the petitioner's representations dated 08.05.2023, 25.10.2021 and 25.11.2021 for mutation of his name in the revenue records and for issuance of pattadar passbooks in respect of land in an extent of Ac.0-81 cents in R.s.No.561/2 and Ac.1-53 cents in R.S.No.562/5, total Ac.2-34 cents situated in Erragutlapalli Village, Chintalapudi Mandal, Eluru District.

2. Heard Sri Komma Vijaya Raj Kumar, learned counsel for petitioner, Sri Venkata Satyanarayana, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue.

3. Sri Komma Vijaya Raj Kumar, learned counsel, while reiterating the contents of the writ affidavit would contend that despite making series of applications the authorities did not either mutate the name of the petitioner in revenue records nor issue pattadar passbooks. Accordingly, prayed to allow the writ petition.

4. On the other hand, Sri Venkata Satyanarayana, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, would contend that pursuant to the representation made by the petitioner, the authorities having found that there was violation of the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands

(Prohibition of Transfers) Act, 1977 issued Form-I and Form-II notices to the assignee as well as to the petitioner found in occupation of the assigned land. The writ petition being meritless deserves dismissal. Accordingly, prayed to dismiss the writ petition.

5. Perused the material available on record and considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. G.O.Ms.No.209 Revenue (EA & AR) Department dated 14.06.2017 and G.O.Ms.No.3 Information Technology & Communications (Infra) Department, dated 22.02.2012 are germane for the present purpose.

7. The relevant portion of G.O.Ms.No.209 is extracted herein for better understanding.

> "The Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, in his D.O.Letter read above, has proposed to introduce a new service to "Print Title Deed-cum-Pattadar Pass Book (PPB) through Mee Seva". The Title Deed-cum-PPB are being issued at present through Mee Seva Service of "Mutation + Title Deed-cum-Pattadar Pass Book".

8. Similarly, relevant portion of G.O.Ms.No.3 reads as follows:

> "In order to achieve uniformity and efficiency, it is decided that the statutory services, which are delivered through Mee Seva shall not be delivered in parallel in the manual format and all the departments and officials should scrupulously follow the Mee Seva protocol. Separate initiatives and stand alone applications running as of now in

various districts shall also be merged and subsumed in the Mee Seva."

9. Perusal of the said G.Os makes it clear that a person, who intends to get statutory services, such as mutation and obtaining pattadar pass book and title deed, has to submit application through online by using Mee-seva services only.

10. In the present case, the petitioner has not filed any application for updating their revenue records through mee- seva, except submitting representations, and as such, the revenue authorities have not considered their representations.

11. In view of the above and taking the submissions of both the learned counsel into consideration and with their consent, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, is inclined to dispose of the Writ Petition, at the admission stage itself, by passing the following order:

(i) The petitioner is at liberty to make application through mee-seva as per the rules by duly enclosing the material in support of his claim.

(ii) On receipt of such application, the authority concerned shall consider and dispose of the same after affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner in accordance with law, within a

stipulated period as per the rules in vogue and communicate the same to the petitioner.

12. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

6TH October, 2026

RR