APHC010579412026

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

MONDAY, THE 2nd DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 31742/2026

Between:

1. SHAIK MASTHAN VALI, S/O. KHASIM VAIL, AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS, MUSLIM, CULTIVATION, R/O. THANGELLA VILLAGE, MARRIPUDI MANDAL, PRAKASAM DISTRICT - 523271.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT - 522238.
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, PRAKASAM DISTRICT, PRAKASAM BHAVAN, ONGOLE - 523001.
3. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, KANDUKUR DIVISION, PRAKASAM DISTRICT - 523105.
4. THE TAHSILDAR, MARRIPUDI MANDAL, PRAKASAM DISTRICT - 523240.
5. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER, MARRIPUDI POLICE STATION, PRAKASAM DISTRICT - 523240.
6. THE REVENUE INSPECTOR, MARRIPUDI MANDAL, PRAKASAM DISTRICT - 523240.
7. THE VILLAGE REVENUE OFFICER, THANGELLA VILLAGE,

MARRIPUDI MANDAL, PRAKASAM DISTRICT -523271.

...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 the Respondents 2 to 7, in attempting to dispossess the Petitioner from Ac.3.42 cents of dry land in Sy.No.384/2 of Thangella Village, Marripudi Mandal, Prakasam District, covered by Patta No.831 at the instance of third parties, without following due process of law, as being illegal, arbitrary, without jurisdiction and violative of Articles 14, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents not to interfere with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the Petitioner over the above said land, and not to alter, cancel or resume the assignment or the revenue entries standing in his favour, except in accordance with procedure known to law

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 direct the Respondents No. 2 to 7, not to dispossess the Petitioner with his peaceful possession and enjoyment of land admeasuring Ac.3.42 cents of dry land in Sy.No.384/2 of Thangella Village, Marripudi Mandal, Prakasam District, pending disposal of the above writ petition

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. GUNDALA SIVA PRASADA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR HOME
2. GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following:

ORDER

Heard Sri Gundala Siva Prasada Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri M.Chandra Sekhar, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, for the respondents.

2. Complaining of interference by the respondents 2 to 7 in respect of land of an extent of Ac.3.42 cents in S.No.384/2 of Thangella village, Marripudi Mandal, Prakasam District, the above writ petition is filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the property referred to supra was assigned to the petitioner and thereafter, the name of the petitioner was updated in the Record of Rights. Copies of Form 1-B (ROR), Adangal, and Pattadar Pass Book are filed as Exs. P1 to P3. He further submits that the petitioner filed a suit O.S.No.145 of 2022 seeking perpetual injunction against the private individuals, when they tried to encroach. The defendants were set *ex parte,* and the suit was decreed on 26.06.2023. Be that as it may, the respondents 2 to 7 are interfering with the subject land.

4. Sri M.Chandra Sekhar, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, for the respondents, on instructions of the 4th respondent-Tahsildar, would submit that as per the records, the petitioner is the pattadar, but he is not in possession and enjoyment of the said land. The petitioner alienated the said land to Kottapalli Prasada Rao, by way of an unregistered agreement of sale. The authorities are not interfering with the aforementioned land.

5. The written instructions of the 4th respondent are made part of the record.

6. Given the written instructions of the 4th respondent, keeping the writ petition pending and inviting a counter will not serve any purpose.

7. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of at the admission stage, with the consent of learned counsel on either side, directing the respondent authorities not to interfere with the subject land without following due process of law. No order as to costs.

As a sequel, all pending miscellaneous applications shall stand closed.

JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

PVD