APHC010487842026

**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: 26587/2026**

**Between:**

1. K.SHAMSHUDDIN, S/O K.PEDDA HUSSAIN SAB, AGE 59 YEARS, RIO H.N. 6-292/1, NEAR MRK TEMPLE,AND KOSIGI OCC-CULTIVATION KURNOOL DISTRICT-518313

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR DISTRICT-522237
2. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, ADONI, KURNOOL DISTRICT-518301
3. THE TAHSILDAR, KOSIGI, KURNOOL DISTRICT-518313
4. SMT K KAJA BI, W/O LATE ABDUL RAHMAN, R/O HO.35, BEHIND PEDDA MASJID, 6TH WARD KOSIGI, KURNOOL DISTRICT-518313

**...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 pass orders in exercise of power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus declaring the impugned action of the respondents in keeping the petitioners land in Sy.No.135 of Thummiganuru, Kosigi Mandal in dispute register without any basis or evidence as arbitrary, illegal, misconceived, abuse of power and violative of Article 14, 19, 21 and 300 A of the of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to delete the petitioner's land in

Sy.No.135 of Thumnniganuru, Kosigi Mandal in an extent of Ac.5.34 Cents from the dispute register

**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 to suspend adverse entries in the revenue records pertaining to land in Sy.No.135 of Thummiganuru, Kosigi Mandal in dispute register pending disposal of the above writ petition

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1. KASA JAGANMOHAN REDDY

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

1. GP FOR REVENUE

**The Court made the following order:**

Heard Sri Kasa Jaganmohan Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Sri Chandra Sekhar, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue for respondents 1 to 3. Despite service of notice, none appeared on behalf of the 4th respondent.

2. Assailing the endorsement issued by the 3rd respondent *vide* R.C.B.No.154/2025 dated 16.06.2025 (Ex.P1), the above writ petition is filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner purchased an extent of Ac.5.34 cents in Sy.No.135 of Thummiganuru Village, Kosigi Mandal, Kurnool District, under a Registered Document *vide* Document No.709/2006 dated 15.05.2006. The petitioner has been in possession and enjoyment of the property. Learned counsel further submits that the 4th respondent's husband filed a complaint before the Revenue Divisional Officer (2nd respondent), pursuant to which the 2nd respondent initiated proceedings *vide* RC.E.No.1912/2017 and directed that the property be kept in the dispute register. The petitioner appeared before the 2nd respondent. However, the 4th respondent's husband failed to appear. Despite the same, the 3rd respondent issued an endorsement *vide* Ex.P1. Learned counsel further submits that the

petitioner submitted a representation dated 07.04.2025 to the 2nd respondent, seeking information regarding the status of R.C.E.No.1912/2017. In response, the 2nd respondent's office informed the petitioner that no such file was available. It is contended that keeping the subject property in the dispute register, in the absence of any restraint order passed by either the High Court or the competent Civil Court, is impermissible under Standing Order 219(b).

4. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue submitted the instructions of the 3rd respondent and would contend that, as per the available records, the subject property was entered in the dispute register on account of the pendency of O.S.No.304 of 2021 on the file of the II Additional Junior Civil Judge, Adoni. However, he fairly submits that no order restraining alienation of the subject property was passed in the suit.

5. Keeping the property in the dispute register was considered by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in W.A.No.817 of 2024, wherein it was observed as follows:

> *"15. The guidelines issued by the Chief Commissioner of land administration do not trace their power to any statutory provision of law. In such circumstances the only provision that can be applied would be Rule 32 of the ROR Rules, which requires the details of suits filed under Section 8 (2) of the ROR Act to be included, in a register maintained for this purpose. This would mean that the above guidelines, would not apply to suits which fall outside the provisions of Section 8(2) of the ROR Act. In the present case, the suit in question is a suit for partition and does not, in any manner, falls under the provisions of Section 8(2) of the ROR Act. Consequently, there would be no question of including the land, which is sought to be partitioned, in the dispute register.*
>
> *16. In that view of the matter, the guidelines of the Chief Commissioner, Land Administration cannot result in all kinds of suits being entered into the dispute register maintained under Rule 32 of the ROR Rules.14*
>
> *17. While there does not appear to be any statutory backing for the guidelines set out by the Chief Commissioner, Land Administration, for disputes and suits falling outside Section 8(2) of the ROR Act, we would hasten to add that there is a pressing need for the creation of a dispute register in which any dispute between parties over land, is recorded, to*

*protect innocent third parties, purchasing such land, from being dragged into such litigation or by virtue of accepting such property as security for any loans that may be advanced. It would be appropriate, if the government were to consider this pressing need and establish a statutory basis for the creation of a dispute register with rules set out for inclusion and removal of properties from such a dispute register. We may also observe that such dispute register may be used as a reference point for verification of title and for verification if there is a cloud over the title of the person claiming ownership over the land. It may not be appropriate to insist that properties entered in the dispute register cannot be alienated. Any such stipulation, may result in power being granted to revenue authorities to decide title of the claimants."*

6. In the case at hand, as seen from the averments in the affidavit coupled with instructions of the 3rd respondent, there is no restraint order either by the High Court or the Civil Court restraining alienation. Mere pendency of the suit is no ground to keep the property in the dispute register.

7. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, without going into the merits of the matter, the Writ Petition is disposed of at the stage of admission with the consent of learned counsel appearing on either side, directing the Joint Collector, Kurnool District, and respondents 2 and 3 to delete an extent of Ac.5.34 cents in Sy.No.135 of Thummiganuru Village, Kosigi Mandal, Kurnool District, from the dispute register, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two (02) 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: 27.10.2026
SNI

**130**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 26587 OF 2026**

Date: 27.10.2026
SNI