



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

[3331]

MONDAY, THE NINTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 3643/2026

Between:

Muddada Govindarajulu,

...PETITIONER

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. MOHAMMAD NAYAB RASOOL

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

The Court made the following:

Rule Nisi. Call for records.

Learned Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj and Rural Development takes notice on behalf of the respondents 1 to 3.

Sri Y.Koteswara Rao, learned Standing counsel takes notice, offers to file vakalat on behalf of the respondents 4 and 5.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to take out personal notice to the respondents 6 and 7 by speed post with acknowledgement due and file proof of service in the Registry.

Impugning the proceedings issued by the 4th respondent *vide* Rc.No.216/2002/A dated 31.01.2026 (Ex.P1), directing the petitioner to demolish the compound wall and further directed the petitioner not to enter into the scheduled land in Sy.No.219-1B1, Gottipalli Revenue, Narasannapeta Mandal, the above writ petition was filed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner purchased the subject property under a registered sale deed dated 06.08.2018 (Ex.P3). He would also contend that in view of the mistake in survey number, the same was rectified *vide* Rectification Deed No.2729/2020 dated 18.12.2020 (Ex.P4). The petitioner obtained permission from the 6th respondent dated 26.08.2023 (Ex.P2) and making construction. The 4th respondent without having jurisdiction issued the proceedings impugned.

Sri Chaitanya, learned counsel representing Sri Y.Koteswara Rao, learned Standing counsel for the respondents 4 and 5, would fairly submit that the 4th respondent had no jurisdiction to issue notice. In case of any deviation, the Executive Officer of the 5th respondent is the competent authority.

Given the facts and circumstances, there shall be stay of all further proceedings pursuant to the proceedings *vide* Rc.No.216/2002/A dated 31.01.2026 (Ex.P1). However, the petitioner shall not make any construction contrary to the sanctioned plan.

List the matter on 09.03.2026.

SUBBA REDDY SATTI, J
SNI