



**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: 20885/2025

Between:

1.K SREERAMULU, S/O K.CHINNABBA, AGED 69 YEARS,
OCC RETIRED EMPLOYEE, R/O D.NO. 19-7-109/B1,
R.C.ROAD, GOPALARAJU COLONY, TIRUPATI URBAN,
TIRUPATI DISTRICT

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
VELAGAPUDI, AMRAVATHI.

2.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, TIRUPATI.

3.THE TAHSILDAR, VADAMALAPETA MANDAL TIRUPATI
DISTRICT.

4.K VISWANATH REDDY, S/O KRISHNA REDDY, AGED 60
YEARS, OCC AGRICULTURIST, R/O CHIGURUVADA
NORTH KANDRIGA, TIRUPATI RURAL, TIRUPATI 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 may be pleased to issue a Writ/s,

Order/s more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction of the respondent No. 3 pursuant to representations of the petitioners dt. as being illegal arbitrary and unconstitutional and consequently direct the respondent No. 3 to conduct enquiry and mutate the name of petitioner in respect of land admeasuring land admeasuring Ac.2.38 cents in Sy. No. 336/3 of Chiguruvada North Kandriga, Tirupati Rural mandal, Tirupati District, by removing the name of the respondent No. 4 and be pleased to pass such

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 may be pleased to suspend the revenue record, pertaining to the land in Sy. No. 336/3 of Chiguruvada North Kandriga, Tirupati Rural mandal, Tirupati District, in respect of land admeasuring Acs. 2.38 cents, standing in the name of the respondent No. 4, pending disposal of the writ petition and be pleased to pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.V VENKATA MAYUR

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. 20885of 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 petitioner's representation dated 13.12.2024 must be considered by the respondents, examined thoroughly, issue orders accordingly, and communicate the decision to the petitioner. 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

156

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHARA RAO

W.P.No. 20885 OF 2025

Date: 07.08.2025

Sj