



**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: 3882/2018

Between:

1.Y RAMA DEVI, W/O PENCHALAI AH, AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS, R/ O
D.NO. 28-3-1699, KISAN NAGAR, SIMHAPURI COLONY, NELLORE,
SPSR NELLORE DISTRICT

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR
DISTRICT.

2.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, SPSR NELLORE DISTRICT, AT
NELLORE

3.THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, NELLORE, SPSR NELLORE
DISTRICT

4.THE TAHASIDAR, NELLORE MNADAL, NELLORE, SPSR NELLORE
DISTRICT

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.PENUMAKA VENKATA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR REVENUE (AP)

The Court made the following Order:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner. Also heard Mr. K Arjun Chowdary, learned Assistant Government Pleader.

2. The present writ petition is filed seeking to declare the action of the respondent No.4 in trying to dispossess the petitioner from the land admeasuring an extent of Ac.0.60 cents in Survey No.2005/C/2-2 situated in Nellore Bit-2, Venkateswarapuram of Nellore, SPSR Nellore District and brick industry thereon as illegal, arbitrary etc and for the consequential directions.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner made submissions to the effect that one Y.Narayana purchased the above said extent of land *vide* Document dated 07.11.2009 and the petitioner purchased the same from the said Y. Narayana *vide* Sale deed dated 06.06.2011. He submits that the petitioner established a small scale industry for manufacturing of Cement Bricks in the above mentioned property and is in possession and enjoyment of the same. He submits that as the respondent No.4 resorted to highhanded action of demolishing the constructions and removing the power connection without issuing any notice or by following due procedure, the present writ petition is filed. He submits that unless appropriate remedies are granted, the petitioner will suffer serious prejudice and irreparable loss.

4. On the other hand, Mr. K Arjun Chowdary, learned Assistant Government Pleader, made submissions with reference to the averments made in the counter-affidavit of the respondent No.4. He submits that total extent of Ac.21.65 cents in Survey No.2005/C is classified as Bund poramboke-Government land and any transaction in respect of the Government land is null and void and does not confer any right to the purchaser. Be that as it may.

5. The learned counsel submits that the statement in the writ affidavit that the petitioner established the cement brick manufacturing unit is not true or

correct and in fact there was no cement bricks industry in the subject matter land as claimed by the writ petitioner. He submits that the writ petition is misconceived and liable to be dismissed.

6. The learned counsel also submits that no reply-affidavit is filed denying the averments made in the counter-affidavit and thus, the averments made therein are deemed to have been admitted.

7. Considered the submissions made by the learned counsel on both sides.

8. The grievance of the petitioner is that the respondent authorities are interfering with his possession and enjoyment of the subject matter property. However, denying the same and making specific assertions that subject matter land is classified as “Bund Poramboke” and further that there is no cement brick industry as claimed by the writ petitioner in the land in question, a counter-affidavit was filed to which no reply-affidavit is filed. Under the said circumstances, the writ petitioner in the considered opinion of this Court is not entitled for any relief.

9. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs. Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

Date:11.11.2025

Ksj