



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

**[3331]**

WEDNESDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF APRIL  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 8402/2026**

**Between:**

Sabbella Srinivasa Reddy and Others

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**AND**

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

**...RESPONDENT(S)**

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

1.A K KISHORE REDDY

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

1.GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

**The Court made the following:**

Heard Sri A. K. Kishore Reddy, the learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri Rajesh Kumar, the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj appearing for respondents 1 to 4, Ms. Usha, the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue appearing for the respondent No.5 and Sri Chaitanya, learned counsel representing Sri Y. Koteswara Rao, learned Standing Counsel for the 6<sup>th</sup> respondent.

2. The grievance of the petitioners is that the respondents 2 to 6 are interfering with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the petitioners' property situated in Sy.No.397/1 of Komaripalem Village, Bikkavolu Mandal, East Godavari District, without following the due process of law.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner purchased the property admeasuring 72.6 Sq. Yards or 0.1½ cents in Sy.No.397/1 of Komaripalem Village, under a registered document dated 22.02.2013 (Ex.P8). The 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner purchased the property admeasuring 58.56 Sq. yards in Sy.No.397/1 of Komaripalem Village, under a registered document dated 22.02.2013 (Ex.P9). Learned counsel would also submit that the structure of the petitioners was demolished by the authorities, without following the due procedure.

4. Sri Chaitanya, the learned counsel appearing for the 6<sup>th</sup> respondent, on instructions of the Panchayat Secretary, would submit that the authorities are intending to lay the road in Sy.No.387. He would also submit that the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner constructed two buildings bearing Door Nos.143 and 143/1 in Sy.No.397/1A, but not in Sy.No.397/1 and the petitioner encroached upon the land belongs to R & B. As per the Survey Report of the Tahsildar, the land of an extent of Ac.1.38 cents is available in Sy.No.387, belongs to R & B. No part of the land in Sy.No.397/1 is touched or demolished. Learned counsel would further submit that the sketch annexed to the instructions would indicate the encroachments in Sy.No.385 and also the petitioners' land in Sy.No.397. He would further submit that the petitioners' own Ac.0.01 cent, but not the land admeasuring 131.16 Sq. yards as claimed by the petitioners under the documents referred *supra*.

5. To resolve the dispute, this Court deems it appropriate to direct the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent- Tahsildar to conduct a survey and fix the boundaries to the petitioners' properties and submit the report to this Court. The petitioners shall bear the expenses. The 4<sup>th</sup> respondent shall adhere to the procedure by issuing notices to all the boundary holders, as mandated in the Andhra Pradesh Survey and Boundaries Act, 1923, before the survey. The petitioners shall cooperate during the survey. The 6<sup>th</sup> respondent shall not take any coercive steps with regard to the petitioners' property to an extent of 131.16 Sq. yards in Sy.No.397 (397/1A).

6. Post the matter on 08.04.2026.

Dated: 01.04.2026  
SCH

---

**SUBBA REDDY SATTI, J**