



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

[3330]

MONDAY, THE ELEVENTH DAY OF AUGUST
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 20993/2025

Between:

1. SONTAM SREEVANI, W/O. SONTAM NAGALOKESHWAR REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 45 YEARS, R/O. THOLLAGANGANAPALLI VILLAGE,
VALLUR MANDAL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY REVENUE DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS
VELAGAPUDI GUNTUR DISTRICT ANDHRA PRADESH.

2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, KADAPA, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT.

3. THE JOINT COLLECTOR, KADAPA, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT.

4. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, KADAPA, YSR KADAPA
DISTRICT.

5. THE TAHSILDAR, VALLUR MANDAL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT.

6. THE GRAMPANCHAYAT, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
THOLLAGANGANAPALLI VILLAGE, VALLUR MANDAL, YSR KADAPA
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 pass an order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in

interfering with peaceful possession and trying to dispossess the petitioner more particularly respondent no. 5 without considering representation, dated. 30.07.2025 made by the petitioner pursuant to notice, Index number. B/444/2025, dated. 19.07.2025 in regard to an extent of Ac.6.13 cents in Sy.No.66/3 and 181 in Thollaganganapalli Village, Vallur Mandal, YSR Kadapa District as illegal and arbitrary and apart from being violation of the fundamental rights guaranteed to us under Articles 14, 19, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents particularly respondent no. 5 to not interfere with the petitioner's peaceful possession and enjoyment to an extent of Ac.6.13 cents in Sy.No.66/3 and 181 in Thollaganganapalli Village, Vallur Mandal, YSR Kadapa District and to 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 to direct the respondents particularly respondent no.5 to consider the explanation, dated: 30.07.2025 and pass

IA NO: 2 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 to direct the respondents particularly respondent no.5 to not interfere with the petitioner's peaceful possession and enjoyment and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P RAVIKANTH

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR REVENUE

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO

WRIT PETITION NO. 20993 of 2025

ORDER:

Pithily this writ petition is filed on the grounds that a representation was made to the authorities, 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 respondents are directed that the petitioner's representation dated 30.07.2025 must be considered by the respondents, examined thoroughly, issue orders accordingly, and communicate the decision given 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. With the above observation, the Writ Petition is disposed of. Till the disposal of the representation, the respondent authority shall not evict the petitioner from the subject land. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous Petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO

Date: 11.08.2025
SNI

143

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHARA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.20993 of 2025

Date: 11.08.2025

SNI