

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE No.W.P.No.14497 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
1.	15.05.2026	<p><u>GTK,J</u></p> <p>Heard Ms.Neha Hassan, learned counsel representing Mr.J.Sudheer, learned counsel for the petitioners, Mr.G.Ramachandra Rao, learned Government Pleader for School Education appearing for respondent Nos.4, 11 and 12, Smt.Vallabhaneni Sireesha Rani, learned Standing Counsel for Municipalities appearing for respondent No.5 and Mr.V.Venugopala Rao, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Sri Venkata Durga Rao Anantha, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.13/caveator.</p> <p>The Writ Petition is filed seeking a Writ of Mandamus, declaring the transactions/alienations/sale undertaken pertaining to the parcel of lands in Sy.Nos. 645/10, 645/13, 685/1, 686/3, 956/16, 959/1, 960/1A, 960/1D, 676/1, 674/1, 674/2 & 668/1 to an extent of Ac.16-85 Cents and Sy.Nos.960/1 & 960/B admeasuring Ac.1-50 Cents (school property) situated in Bapatla Town, Guntur District as null and void in the teeth of C.S. No. 124 of 1998 and also under Section 28 of the AP Education Act, 1982 and in the view of the judgment of this Hon'ble Court in W.P. No. 5877 of 2003 dt.02.06.2016. Consequently, to direct the respondents to take necessary steps to evict the encroachers and demolish the illegal structures constructed in Sy.Nos.645/10, 645/13, 685/1, 686/3,</p>	Contd....

	<p>956/16, 959/1, 960/1A, 960/1D, 676/1, 674/1, 674/2 & 668/1, Bapatla, Guntur; and further direct the respondents not to grant any building permission or register any subsequent sale transactions in respect of the subject land in Sy.Nos.645/10 645/13 685/1, 686/3, 956/16 959/1, 960/1A, 960/1D, 676/1 674/1, 674/2 & 668/1, Bapatla.</p> <p>In support of the said prayer, the learned counsel for the petitioner argued by taking this Court through the contentions raised in the writ affidavit, and the same was refuted through arguments by the learned Senior Advocate, Sri Venugopal Rao.V.</p> <p>Since, the matter involves both factual and legal aspects, this Court is of the opinion that, in the interest of justice, it would suffice to direct the authorities to dispose of the representation made by the petitioner on 02.05.2026.</p> <p>Upon a pointed query, learned Senior Advocate Mr. J. Sudheer, contended that the representation filed by the petitioner also includes the facts narrated in the affidavit and that it would suffice if the respondents act upon the said representation by applying their mind to the facts and circumstances of the case and pass appropriate orders.</p> <p>It is needless to mention that the constructions, if any, as argued by the learned Senior Counsel, which are going on hectically, shall be subject to the outcome of the Writ Petition.</p> <p>Learned Government Pleader for Education submits that the representation, said to have been made, was initially submitted to the Tahsildar and was</p>	Contd....
--	---	-----------

also submitted to the Collector on 04.05.2026.

It is placed on record that a copy of the representation, dated 02.05.2026, was addressed to the Collector, and the Collector, being the competent authority, is directed to dispose of the said representation, within a period of four (04) weeks, by looking into the contentions raised in the affidavit and by giving opportunity to both parties.

List the matter after Summer Vacation, 2026.

Pmk

GTK,J