



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

[3209]

**TUESDAY, THE ELEVENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

WRIT PETITION NO: 2017/2018

Between:

- 1.S. GEELANI, S/O. LATE SATHAR SAB S.A AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS,
OCC- CULTIVATION, R/O. LAKKANAPALLE, BAIREDDIPALLE
MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICTLAKKANAPALLE CHITTOOR
DISTRICT
- 2.S.A. HUMAYUN, S/O. LATE SATHAR SAB S.A AGED ABOUT 45
YEARS, OCC- CULTIVATION R/O. LAKKANAPALLE,
BAIREDDIPALLE MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT
- 3.S. JAHANGEER BASHA, S /O. LATE SATHAR SAB S.A AGED ABOUT
41 YEARS, R/O. LAKKANAPALLE, BAIREDDIPALLE MANDAL,
CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
- 4.S.KHALEEF, S/O. LATE SATHAR SAB S.A AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS,
OCC- CULTIVATION R/O. LAKKANAPALLE, BAIREDDIPALLE
MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT
- 5.S.A. MUZEER, S/O. LATE SATHAR SAB S.A AGED ABOUT 33
YEARS, OCC- CULTIVATION R/O. LAKKANAPALLE,
BAIREDDIPALLE MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT
- 6.S.A. SAMEUNNISSA, D/O. LATE SATHAR SAB AGED ABOUT, R/O.
36 YEARS LAKKANAPALLE, BAIREDDIPALLE MANDAL, CHITTOOR
DISTRICT.
- 7.S.A. RESHMA, D/O. LATE SATHAR SAB S.A AGED ABOUT 31
YEARS, R/O. LAKKANAPALLE, BAIREDDIPALLE MANDAL,
CHITTOOR DISTRICT

8.S.HUMILA, W/O. LATE S.A. SHAJAHAN AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS,
R/O. LAKKANAPALLE, BAIREDDIPALLE MANDAL, CHITTOOR
DISTRICT

9.S.A. JAKEER HUSSAIN, S/O. LATE SATHAR SAB S.A AGED ABOUT
35 YEARS, OCC- CULTIVATION R/O. LAKKANAPALLE,
BAIREDDIPALLE MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1.STATE OF AP, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE
DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR
DISTRICT SECRETARIAT VELAGAPUDI GUNTUR DISTRICT

2.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, CHITTOOR DISTRICT

3.THE SUB COLLECTOR, MADANAPALLI, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

4.THE TAHSILDAR, GANGAVARAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.V

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1.K RAMAMOCHAN

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR REVENUE (AP)

The Court made the following Order:

Heard Ms. Y Maha Lakshmi, learned counsel representing the learned counsel for the petitioners. Also heard Mr. K Arjun Chowdary, learned Assistant Government Pleader.

2. The present writ petition is filed alleging highhanded action by the respondent No.4 in dispossessing the petitioners from the land of an extent of Ac.0.80 cents in Survey No.319 and Ac.6.72 cents in Survey No.314/2 of Gandrajupalli Village, as illegal, contrary to law etc.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners made submissions with reference to the averments made in the affidavit filed in support of writ petition and drawing the attention of this Court to the interim order dated 01.02.2018 granted at the time of ordering notice before admission. She submits that if the lands in question are required for any purpose, the authorities concerned are required to follow the procedure as contemplated under law and as the respondent authorities more particularly respondent No.4 is resorting to highhanded action of dispossessing the petitioners, they are constrained to file the present writ petition.

4. She submits that in the similar circumstances, W.P No.41475 of 2017 filed in respect of the land situated in Survey No.319/2 of adjacent village was disposed of by an order dated 07.12.2017 by a learned Judge of the erstwhile Common High Court for the State of Telangana and Andhra Pradesh.

5. However, the learned Assistant Government Pleader, Mr. K Arjun Chowdary, made submissions on the basis of the counter-affidavit filed by the respondent No.4. He submits that as stated in para-8, the petitioners are not having any right over the subject matter land, they are encroachers and some of the encroachments have been removed except certain portions, the details of which are set out in the counter-affidavit.

6. He also submits that the writ petitioners are not having any rights over the subject matter properties which are purchased in violation of the provisions of assignment. He further states that he is short of latest instructions as to whether any action was initiated pursuant to the interim order dated 01.02.2018 passed by this Court.

7. Considering the submissions made, this Court, instead of keeping the writ petition pending and granting time, deems it appropriate to dispose of the same, providing that the respondents shall not initiate any action against the subject matter property except by following due procedure as per law.

8. With the above direction, this Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs. Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

Date:11.11.2025

Ksj