

APHC010138262025



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

[3329]

TUESDAY ,THE FIRST DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA

WRIT PETITION NO: 8411/2025

Between:

Sri Vidyaranya Gurukula Vaidika Patasala Sangam,

...PETITIONER

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.JITENDRA KANYALUR

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR HOME

2.GP FOR REVENUE

3.PANGA SIVANARAYANA

The Court made the following:

1. Sri K. Jitendra, Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, in similar circumstances, this Hon'ble Court was pleased to pass an order in W.A.Nos.299 & 300 of 2025 dated 24.03.2025, directing the parties to maintain status quo and remanded the matter to the learned Single Judge for fresh adjudication. Learned counsel further submits that, in view of the orders passed in W.A.Nos.299 & 300 of 2025 dated 24.03.2025, the present writ

petition is also similarly situated regarding the subject property, therefore, the petitioner is also entitled for the same interim relief of *status quo*, as such, this Hon'ble Court may extend similar order to this petitioner, pending writ petition.

2. On the other hand, Sri Ganta Rama Rao, learned Senior Counsel appearing for Respondent Nos.7 to 10 submits that the petitioner is not entitled for similar relief as was granted in favour of third parties/petitioner therein in W.A.Nos.299 & 300 of 2025 dated 24.03.2025, for the reason that the petitioner herein had suffered with the judgment rendered by the Land Grabbing Court and also the claim of the petitioner was also rejected by this Court as well as Hon'ble Apex Court in SLP (C) No.008511/2023 dated 14.04.2023, wherein, the Apex Court observed as follows:

“Learned counsel for the respondents has brought to our notice that SLP(C) No. 19023/2021 which is referred in the order impugned that apart is distinguishable for the reason that the order originally passed by the authority declaring the petitioner and others the land grabbers under its order dated 16th April, 1990. The petitioner before this Court in SLP(C) No. 19023/2021 is not a party. But so far as the present petitioner is concerned, his predecessors in interest were party to the proceedings in the order dated 16th April, 1990 and once the order has attained finality, at least the present petitioner has no right to question and are under obligation to hand over the possession”

3. Learned Senior Counsel submits that, in view of the orders of the Hon'ble Apex Court in SLP (C) No.008511/2023 dated 14.04.2023, the

petitioner herein is not entitled for any relief, muchless on par with third parties who are not parties to the earlier proceedings which were held against the petitioner.

4. Considering the submissions made by Sri K. Jitendra, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Ganta Rama Rao, learned Senior Counsel for Respondent Nos.7 to 10, and on perusal of the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No.008511/2023 dated 14.04.2023 and judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this High Court in W.A.Nos.299 & 300 of 2025 dated 24.03.2025, the claim of the petitioner is not similar to the claim of the petitioner(s) in W.A.Nos.299 & 300 of 2025. In view of the orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No.008511/2023 dated 14.04.2023, certainly the petitioner is not entitled to any relief, muchless, the relief granted to third parties in W.A.Nos.299 & 300 of 2025.

5. Accordingly, the petitioner is not entitled to any interim relief, as prayed for, in this writ petition.

6. For further hearing, post the writ petition after four (04) weeks.

VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA,J

Date: 01.04.2025

Copy by 03.04.2025

b/o

SP