



**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: 20904/2025

Between:

1. YAMASANI VEERA VENKATA SATYA NAGALAKSHMI, W/O. SATYA PRASADA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS, R/O.D.NO.16-83, MAIN ROAD, BICCAVOLU MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
2. MULLANGI PRASHANTHI, , W/O. M. VENKATA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS, R/O. D.NO.6-155, MAIN ROAD, BICCAVOLU MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP.BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, KAKINADA DISTRICT.
3. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, PEDDAPURAM REVENUE DIVISION KAKINADA DISTRICT.
4. THE TAHSILDAR, GANDEPALLE MANDAL, KAKINADA 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 topleased to issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ or direction declaring the action of the respondents in not considering representation dt.14.04.2025 (dispatched on 02.07.2025) and mutating the names of the petitioners in online revenue records with respect to subject lands admeasuring an extent of Ac.2.53 cents in Sy.No.162, Ac.2.68 cents in Sy.No.235/1, Ac.0.25 cents in Sy.No.235/2, Ac.1.40 cents in Sy.No.238/1, Ac.1.97 cents in Sy.No.238/2 and Ac.0.38 cents in Sy.No.238/4 totalling to an extent of Ac.9.21 cents situated in Gandepalle village and Mandal, Kakinada district as illegal, arbitrary and in violation of Art.21 and 300A of constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to consider the representation dt.14.04.2025 (dispatched on 02.07.2025) and mutate the name of the petitioners in online revenue records pertaining to their subject land and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased pleased to direct the respondents to consider the representation dt. 14.04.2025 (dispatched on 02.07.2025) made by the petitioner's pending disposal of the writ petition and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1.RAVITEJA JAMMALAMADAKA

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. 20904of 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 14.04.2025 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

163

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHARA RAO

W.P.No. 20904 OF 2025

Date: 07.08.2025

Sj