



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

**[3332]**

MONDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF MARCH  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 7788/2026**

**Between:**

Vemireddy Kota Reddy,

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

**...RESPONDENT(S)**

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1. C SUBODH

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1. GP FOR REVENUE

2. GP FOR IRRIGATION AND CAD

3. Y L SIVA KALPANA REDDY

**The Court made the following:**

Notice before admission.

Learned Government Pleader for Irrigation takes notice for respondent Nos.1 and 3.

Learned Government Pleader for Revenue takes notice for respondent Nos.2 and 4.

Sri ASC Bose, learned Standing Counsel for Municipal Corporation takes notice for respondent No.5.

Ms.Y.Siva Kalpana Reddy, learned counsel takes notice for respondent Nos.6 and 7.

For filing counters, post on 21.04.2026.

**I.A.No.1 of 2026**

Impugning the conveyance deed vide document No.4330/2009 dated 01.06.2009 with respect to land in Sy.No.259/3A and further complaining that the authorities are not taking steps to remove the encroachments in Sy.Nos.259/1, 259/3B2 and 259-3B1 situated at Nellore Bit-I, which is canal poramboke land, the subject writ has been filed.

Now, the present application is filed to direct the respondent authorities not to permit the 6<sup>th</sup> respondent to make constructions in the land in Sy.Nos.259/3B1, 259/3B3 of Nellore Bit-I, SPSR Nellore District, which is classified as Canal, pending disposal of the writ petition.

Heard Sri C.Subodh, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri Satish Kumar, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Irrigation, Sri Venkata Satyanarayana, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, Sri ASC Bose, learned Standing Counsel for Municipal Corporation and Ms.Y.L.Siva Kalpana Reddy, learned counsel for respondent Nos.6 and 7.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that by virtue of G.O.Ms.No.166, dated 16.02.2008 and G.O.Ms.No.1601, dated 28.08.2005, it is the Collector who has to regularize the land and execute conveyance deed, but the Deputy Tahsildar, who is incompetent, has executed the conveyance deed by taking into consideration the said

G.Os. In fact, the said land is classified as canal poramboke, and they have no right, even otherwise, to regularize such canal poramboke land. Now, the respondents are constructing commercial complex in the said land. If such constructions are permitted, it affects the rights of the petitioner, being neighbour. Further, the respondents may claim equities at a later point of time. As such, prayed to pass appropriate orders pending writ petition.

Ms.Y.L.Siva Kalpana Reddy, learned counsel, submitted that the said conveyance deed has been executed in the year 2009, and subsequently much water has flown, wherein the 7<sup>th</sup> respondent sold the property to the 6<sup>th</sup> respondent and the petitioner, being a neighbour to the subject property, in a blackmailing tactic, filed the present writ petition only to cause inconvenience and harass the officials without there being any valid legal ground. If at all the petitioner has any grievance, he should have questioned the said conveyance deed then and there itself, but not after a lapse of 17 long years. The writ petition is to be dismissed at the admission on the ground of laches. She further contended that the subject land is not classified as canal poramboke. As such, prayed to dismiss the writ petition at the admission stage itself.

Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue submitted that he has instructions that the land is classified as canal poramboke, but however sought time to file counter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner insisted for interim orders.

Perused the record and considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

The conveyance deed is of the year 2009 and as rightly contended by the learned counsel for unofficial respondents, the writ petition has

been filed after 17 long years. The reasons explained in the affidavit are not prima facie satisfactory to this Court to consider interim orders at this length of time that too without counter. Without receiving any counter, considering the petitioner's prayer and granting interim orders would affect the rights of the unofficial respondents, particularly at this length of 17 years.

In the said view of the fact, this is not a fit case to grant any interim order at this stage.

Accordingly interlocutory application is dismissed.

---

**RAVI CHEEMALAPATI, J**

Date: 23<sup>rd</sup> March, 2026

Note:- Issue CC by 24.03.2026  
B/o JLV