APHC010563122026

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

WEDNESDAY, THE 28th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 31357/2026

Between:

1. SHANKHARAPU MANOHARA, , S/O. S. MALLAYYA, AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS, OCC. CULTIVATION, RIO. D.NO.1-226, MAIN ROAD, REDDIPALLE, NALLAMADA MANDAL, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT, ERSTWHILE ANANTAPUR DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, AT VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT - 522237.
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT, AT PUTTAPARTHI, ERSTWHILE ANANTAPUR DISTRICT -515134.
3. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, KADIRI DIVISION, KADIRI, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT ERSTWHILE ANANTAPUR DISTRICT - 515591.
4. THE TAHSILDAR, TALUPULA MANDAL, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT, ERSTWHILE ANANTAPUR DISTRICT - 515581.

...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, One in the nature of a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Wirt, Direction or Order questioning the action of the 3rd respondent in not mutating name of the petitioner in revenue records by entering his name in online Adangal in respect of his land an extent of Ac.1.50 cents in Sy.No.68 situated at Vepamanupeta Village, Talupula Mandal, Sri Satya Sai District Erstwhile Anantapur District though 4th respondent submitted his report to the 3rd respondent vide Rc.No.38/A/dated 08.02.2026

in pursuance of petitioner representation through PGRS Grievance No.SS1S2025070703349 dated 07.07.2025 as illegal, arbitrary and violative of articles 14, 21 and 300-A of Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to mutate the name of the petitioner in respect of above property

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 direct the respondents to mutate the name of the petitioner in respect of an extent of Ac.1.50 cents in Sy.No.68 situated at Vepamanupeta Village, Talupula Mandal, Sri Satya Sai District Erstwhile Anantapur District by considering the report submitted by the 4th respondent vide Rc.No.38/A/dated 08.02.2026 to the 3rd respondent in pursuance PGRS Grievance No.SSTS2025070703349 dated 07.07.2025 made by the petitioner, pending disposal of the above writ petition,

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P NARAHARI BABU

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following order:

Heard Sri P.Narahari Babu, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Sri Chandra Sekhar, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue for respondents 1 to 4.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner owns of an extent of Ac.1.50 cents in Sy.No.68 at Vepamanupeta Village, Talupula Mandal, Sri Satya Sai District. The petitioner purchased the said property from one Challaboyina Babaiah under a Registered Sale Deed *vide* Document No.1613/2004 dated 04.06.2004, for a valid sale consideration. The petitioner's name was updated in the Record of Rights, and the Pattadar Passbook was issued. A copy of the Registered Sale Deed dated 04.06.2004 is filed as Ex.P5, and a copy of the Pattadar Passbook is filed as Ex.P6. The 4th respondent, without following the procedure contemplated under Section 5 of the Andhra Pradesh Rights in Land and Pattadar Passbooks Act, 1971, deleted the petitioner's name from the Record of Rights in respect of the

aforementioned property. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner made a complaint in PGRS. Pursuant thereto, the 3rd respondent directed the 4th respondent to submit a report. Accordingly, the 4th respondent submitted a report *vide* Rc.No.38/A dated 03.02.2026 (Ex.P2). However, despite the said report, the 3rd respondent is not taking any further action.

3. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, on instructions, would submit that the 1st respondent issued a memo *vide* Govt. Memo REV01/457/2026-PGRS dated 24.09.2026 regarding PGRS. He further submits that PGRS shall be used only as a mechanism for receiving, examining, monitoring, and facilitating the redressal of public grievances, and shall not be treated as a substitute for statutory proceedings prescribed under any enactment, rule, or Statutory scheme. Mere filing of a grievance/representation through PGRS shall not confer any additional jurisdiction or statutory power upon the officer dealing with the grievance. He also submits that the 3rd respondent will issue appropriate endorsement in the matter, keeping in view the circular memo issued by the 1st respondent.

4. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion *vis-à-vis* 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 learned 3rd respondent to pass appropriate orders, strictly as per the law pursuant to the grievance made by the petitioner through PGRS (Ex.P1), and issue an appropriate endorsement, keeping in view the circular memo issued by the 1st respondent. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

Date: 28.10.2026
SNI

152

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 31357 OF 2026

Date: 28.10.2026
SNI