

APHC010134482018



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

[2605]

THURSDAY, THE TWENTIETH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FOUR

**PRESENT
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE U.DURGA PRASAD RAO**

WRIT PETITION NO: 5886/2018

Between:

Aluri Venkateswara Rao, and Others

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

Prl Secy Revenue Dept State Of A P and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1.METTA CHENDRA SEKHAR RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR ASSIGNMENT (AP)

2.GP FOR REVENUE (AP)

3.GP FOR REGISTRATION AND STAMPS (AP)

The Court made the following:**ORDER:**

Notice to unofficial respondents 9 & 12 served.

2. Notice on respondent No.8 returned unserved as addressee died.
3. Notice on respondents 10 & 11 sent but not yet returned.
4. While so, learned counsel for petitioners Sri Metta Chandrasekhar Rao would submit that the petitioners have challenged the action of the 2nd respondent/Chief Commissioner of Land Administration (CCLA), Vijayawada in entertaining the revision petition in CCLA's Ref.No.Settle.II(1)/284/2017 as illegal, arbitrary and against the law and consequently to direct the official

respondents to release all compensatory benefits to the petitioners in respect of the land surrendered by the petitioners.

5. Referring to the aforesaid relief, learned counsel would submit that the petitioner may be given opportunity to question the jurisdiction of the 2nd respondent to maintain the revision petition and pass an appropriate order on merits expeditiously and except that he is not asking for any other relief in the writ petition.

6. Learned Standing Counsel for 2nd respondent reported that the main dispute is between the writ petitioners and unofficial respondents 8 to 12 only and therefore, he left the matter to the discretion of the court.

7. As stated supra, some of the respondents are not served with notices and the respondents who were served have not appeared before this Court. However, having regard to the nature of the relief sought for in the writ petition, this court is of the view that writ petition can be disposed of with a suitable direction.

8. Accordingly, the 2nd respondent is directed to dispose of the revision petition in CCLA's Ref.No.Settle.II(1)/284/2017 expeditiously, but not later than three (3) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the writ petitioners herein and also the unofficial respondents 9 to 12 and all other concerned.

9. With the above direction, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

As a sequel, interlocutory applications pending if any in this writ petition shall stand closed.

U.DURGA PRASAD RAO,J

20.06.2024

Note: Issue C.C. today.

B/o

NNN

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE U.DURGA PRASAD RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 5886/2018

20.06.2024

NNN