



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

[3331]

**THURSDAY, THE TWENTY SIXTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 5745/2026

Between:

Eluri Varalakshmi

...PETITIONER

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. K K DURGA PRASAD

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

2. GP FOR REVENUE

3. GP FOR IRRIGATION AND CAD

The Court made the following order:

Learned Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj and Rural Development takes notice for respondent No.1

Sri Y. Koteswar Rao, learned standing counsel takes notice, offers to file vakalat and seeks time to get instructions.

Learned Government Pleader for Irrigation takes notice for respondents 3 and 4.

Learned Government Pleader for Revenue takes notice for respondent 5 and 6.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner purchased land admeasuring 492.51 square yards (Ac.00-10 cents) out of Ac.6-36 cents in R.S.No.220, situated in Doddanapudi village, Kalla Mandal, West Godavari District, under a registered sale deed, dated 07.10.2024 (Ex.P1). Learned counsel would submit that the petitioner constructed a ramp to reach his land, within the boundaries of the subject land. However, respondents 2 and 3, without issuing any notice attempted to demolish the ramp.

Sri Chaitanya, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 and Sri S. Satish Kumar, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Irrigation, for respondents 3 and 4, on oral instructions would submit that the petitioner constructed a ramp by encroaching upon irrigation bund.

In reply, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that, in fact, the petitioner made an application on 09.01.2026 before respondent No.6-Tahsildar, Kalla Mandal, requesting to survey the land and fix boundaries. The said application is pending consideration.

Whether the petitioner encroached upon irrigation bund, as contended by the learned counsel respondents 2 to 4, or not, is a disputed question of fact.

If the petitioner really encroached upon the irrigation bund, as alleged by respondents 2 to 4, the authorities have to follow due process of law, by issuing show cause notice, calling for the petitioner's explanation and passing a reasoned order.

Given the above facts and circumstances of the case, both the parties shall maintain status quo obtaining as on today, till 27.02.2026.

Post on 27.02.2026 in the 'Adjourned Motion List'.

SUBBA REDDY SATTI, J

IKN