



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

[3330]

THURSDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF AUGUST
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR
RAO**

WRIT PETITION NO: 20901/2025

Between:

1. SRI PASEM NAGAIAH, S/O. KONDAIAH , AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS, OCC . FAMAR, R/O. CHAKALAKONDA VILLAGE, VINJAMUR MANDAL S.P.S.R. NELLORE DISTRICT.
2. SRI DAMMUSREENIVASULU,, S/O. LATEMALAKONDIAH, AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS, OCC . FARMAR, R/O. CHAKALAKONDA VILLAGE, VINJAMUR MANDAL, S.P.S.R. NELLORE DISTRICT.
3. SRI SANKE DAVID,, S/O. VENKAAIAH, AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS, OCC . FASTER/AGRICULTURIST, R/O. CHAKALAKONDA VILLAGE, VINJAMUR MANDAL, S.P.S.R. NELLORE DISTRICT.
4. SMT. VADDE KONDAMMA,, W/O. PULLAAIAH, AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS, OCC . FARMAR R/O. CHAKALAKONDA VILLAGE, VINJAMUR MANDAL, S.P.S.R. NELLORE DISTRICT.
5. CHENUPALLISUMALATHA,, C/O SREENIVASULU, AGE ABOUT. 45 YEARS FARMAR R/O DUTTALUR VILLAGE AND MANDAL, S.P.S.R. NELLORE DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

- 1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
- 2.THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF LAND ADMINISTRATION, MANGALAGIRI, GUNTUR DISTRICT
- 3.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, SPSR NELLORE DISTRICT
- 4.THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, KAVLI TOWN AND MANDAL, SPSR NELLORE DISTRICT
- 5.THE TAHSILDAR, VINJAMUR MANDAL S.P.S.R.NELLORE DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of WRIT OF MANADAMUS declaring the inaction of the 3rd and 5th respondents in complying the order of the 2nd Respondent dated 01.04.2024 as per the representations dated 02.09.2024 and 29.08.2024 as illegal, arbitrary and violation of Article 14, 19, 21 of the Constitution of India and against the principles of natural justice and consequently direct the 3rd respondent to implement the order passed in Proceeding No. BCW1/181/2017 , dated 01.04.2024 and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

- 1.DR G V RAVI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

- 1.GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO**WRIT PETITION No. 20901 of 2025****ORDER:**

Pithily this writ petition is filed on the grounds that a representation was made to the authorities via Meeseva, but it was not addressed. Therefore, it is urged that the respondents be directed to address the representation, as such direction would suffice in the circumstances of the case.

2. In the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in *The Government of India vs P. Venkatesh* reported in (2019) 15 SCC 613 held that:

Dispose of the representation' mantra is increasingly permeating the judicial process in the High Courts and the Tribunals. Such orders may make for a quick or easy disposal of cases in overburdened adjudicatory institutions. But, they do not service to the cause of justice. The litigant is back again before the Court, as this case shows, having incurred attendant costs and suffered delays of the legal process. This would have been obviated by calling for a counter in the first instance, thereby resulting in finality to the dispute.

3. This Court is not oblivious of the fact that a Court to authorities, before directing "consideration" of a claim or representation should examine whether the claim or representation is with reference to a "live" issue or whether it is with reference to a "dead" or "stale" issue. If it is with reference to a "dead" or "stale" issue or dispute, the Court/tribunal should put an end to the matter and should not direct consideration or reconsideration. If the Court to tribunal deciding to direct "consideration" without itself examining the merits, it should

make it clear that such consideration will be without prejudice to any contention relating to limitation or delay and laches. Even if the court does not expressly say so, that would be the legal position and effect."

4. Disposal of proceedings by seemingly innocuous orders directing consideration of representation though result in quick or easy disposal of cases in overburdened adjudicatory institutions but such orders do more disservice than service to the cause of justice.

5. However, the respondent authorities are directed that the petitioners' representation dated 29.08.2024 must be considered by the respondents, examined thoroughly, issue orders accordingly, and communicate the decision to the petitioners. It goes without saying that the entire process will be completed within six weeks from the date of the order is received.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, interlocutory applications, if any pending in this Writ Petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO

Date: 07.08.2025

sj

160

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHARA RAO

W.P.No. 20901 OF 2025

Date: 07.08.2025

Sj