APHC010571842026

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: 31387/2026

Between:

1. ATHIRALA RAVI SANKAR,, S/O A. MUNISWAMY, AGED 59 YEARS, D.NO 2/188, MADRAS ROAD, OPP PETROL BUNK, RAJAMPET, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT - 516 115.
2. ATHIRALA SOBHARANI,, W/O LATE A.SREENIVASULU, AGED 59 YEARS, D.NO 2/189, MADRAS ROAD, OPP PETROL BUNK, RAJAMPET, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT - 516 115.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, A.P. SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI - 522238.
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT - 516269.
3. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, RAJAMPET DIVISION, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT- 516115.

4. THE TAHASILDAR, RAJAMPET MANDAL, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT-516115.
5. THE COMMISSIONER, RAJAMPET MUNICIPALITY, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT - 516115.
6. THE SUB REGISTRAR, RAJAMPET MANDAL, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT - 516115.

...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 a Writ or an order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaration the action of the respondent authorities in issuing an endorsement dated 02.01.2026 pursuant to the representation dated 23.12.2025 whereby the petitioners property admeasuring Ac.0.05 cents in Sy.No.961/134/2 has been treated as Vanka Poramboke and has fallen as under Section 22(A)(1)(B) of the Registration Act, 1908 without conducting proper enquiry and without considering the relevant registered documents, longstanding possession and residential houses and other relevant documents relating to the subject property as highly arbitrary, illegal and in violation of fundamental rights apart from Article 300-A of Constitution of India and consequently to set aside the impugned endorsement and direct the respondents particularly the District collector to conduct proper enquiry by verifying the documents and consider the petitioners claim

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 respondent authorities to delete the subject property from the list of Section 22(1)(A)(B) by conducting the immediate enquiry/survey of the subject property and permit the petitioners to take necessary safety measures

in respect of dilapidated structures including demolition of the unsafe structures, pending disposal of the above writ petition

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. SUDEEPTHI POTLURI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR REVENUE
2. GP FOR REGISTRATION AND STAMPS

The Court made the following order:

Heard Smt. Sudeepthi Potluri, learned counsel for the petitioners; Sri Divya Theja, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, for respondents 1 to 4 and 6; and Sri Lakshmi Narayana, learned standing counsel for respondent No.5.

2. Assailing the endorsement issued by the Commissioner, Rajampet Municipality, Annamayya District vide Roc No.103/2019 PGRS, dated 02.01.2026, the above writ petition was filed.

3. The father of petitioner No.1 purchased land to an extent of admeasuring Ac.0-05 cents in Survey No.961/B4/2 under a registered sale deed in the year 1960 and thereafter constructed residential houses therein in the year 1962. The father of petitioner No.1 died in 1979. Later, in 2007, the petitioner's mother obtained building approval to demolish the old structure and raise a new one. However, new construction was not carried out due to financial constraints. Subsequently, petitioner No.1 sought re-approval from respondent No.5. However, the same was not accepted on the ground that the land on which the structure exists is classified as 'Vanka Poramboke' as per

RSR and the same is included in the list of prohibited properties under Section 22(A)(1)(B) of the Registration Act, 1908 (for short 'the Act'). Petitioner No.1 made a representation in PGRS and respondent No.5 issued the impugned endorsement vide Ex.P1.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that without verifying the title documents, the property was included in the list of prohibited properties under Section 22(A)(1)(B) of the Act.

5. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue would submit that the Government issued G.O.Ms.No.444 Revenue (Registration-I) Department, dated 22.07.2026 and set out guidelines. As per the said G.O., the Revenue Divisional Officer is the competent authority to delete the properties from the list of prohibited properties. If the petitioners make a fresh application, the authority will consider the same and pass appropriate orders. The endorsement issued by the Commissioner, respondent No.5, pursuant to Ex.P2-representation is only an intimation, and it is not an order.

6. In reply, learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners will make a fresh application in terms of G.O.Ms.No.444 Revenue (Registration-I) Department, dated 22.07.2026, by annexing all the relevant documents.

7. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, keeping the writ petition pending and inviting counter will not serve any purpose. Hence, the Writ Petition is disposed of at the admission stage with the consent of learned counsel on either side, giving liberty to the petitioners to make a fresh application in terms of G.O.Ms.No.444, dated 22.07.2026. On receipt of such

application, the competent authority shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders, strictly as per the Rules in vogue. No order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

Date: 28.10.2026
IKN