



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

[3209]

MONDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

**Writ Petition Nos: 23616, 5698, 17472, 20456, 21542, 22616, 23177, 23467,
23539, 23872, 23893, 24186, 24382, 24738, 25036, 25563, 31595, 32702,
37548 and 37770 of 2018**

Writ Petition No.23616 of 2018

Between:

1. PATHAN JILEKHA BI,, W/O SUBHAN KHAN, AGE. 65 YEARS DOOR NO . 4-142, VILLAGE. RAYAPUDI MANDAL . TULLURU, DISTRICT . GUNTUR
2. DASARI VEERANJANEYULU,, S/O VEERABHADRAI, AGE. 48 YEARS DOOR NO . 2-205, VILLAGE. UNDAVALLI MANDAL . TADEPALLI , DISTRICT . GUNTUR
3. YAMPARALA RAMARAO,, S/O VENKATESWRA RAO, AGE. 66 YEARS DOOR NO . 2-95, VILLAGE. LINGAYAPALEM MANDAL . TULLURU, DISTRICT . GUNTUR
4. CHITTIPROLU SRINIVASARAO,, S/O SANKAR RAO, AGE. 30 YEARS DOOR NO . 4-44, VILLAGE. RAYAPUDI MANDAL . TULLURU, DISTRICT . GUNTUR
5. MALLELA SESHAGIRI RAO,, S/O SUBBAYA, AGE. 58 YEARS DOOR NO . 3-35,VILLAGE. RAYAPUDI MANDAL . TULLURU, DISTRICT . GUNTUR
6. SHAIK MAHABUNNIASSA BEGAM,, W/O MOHMAD ADAM, AGE. 30 YEARS DOOR NO . 5-72, VILLAGE. RAYAPUDI MANDAL . TULLURU, DISTRICT . GUNTUR
7. SHAIK MABUSUBHANI,, S/O JOHNY SAHEEB, AGE. 37 YEARS

DOOR NO .3-51/A, VILLAGE. RAYAPUDI MANDAL . TULLURU,
DISTRICT . GUNTUR

8. SHAIK FATHEEMABI,, W/O JOHNY SAHEEB, AGE. 60 YEARS
DOOR NO . 3-51/A, VILLAGE. RAYAPUDI MANDAL . TULLURU,
DISTRICT . GUNTUR
9. SHAIK MUSTHAFAB,, S/O KASEEM KHAN, AGE. 55 YEARS DOOR
NO . 3-48/1, VILLAGE. RAYAPUDI MANDAL . TULLURU, DISTRICT .
GUNTUR
10. SHAIK PEDANAGULMEERASAHEB,, S/O ABDULLA SAHEB, AGE.
64 YEARS DOOR NO . 6-138, VILLAGE. RAYAPUDI MANDAL .
TULLURU, DISTRICT . GUNTUR
11. VALAPARLA SURESH BABU,, S/O JEEVARATNAM, AGE. 46
YEARS DOOR NO . 1-29, VILLAGE. RAYAPUDI MANDAL .
TULLURU, DISTRICT . GUNTUR
12. KOTHAPALLI KOTESWRA RAO,, S/O SIVARAMAKRISHNIAH, AGE.
60 YEARS DOOR NO . 4-102, VILLAGE. RAYAPUDI MANDAL .
TULLURU, DISTRICT . GUNTUR

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, REVENUE DEPARTMENT
(LANDS), SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI. GUNTUR
DISTRICT
2. STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI.
GUNTUR DISTRICT.
3. STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO
GOVERNMENT, CAPITAL REGION DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
(CRDA), SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI. GUNTUR
DISTRICT.
4. CAPITAL REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY CRDA, REP. BY

ITS COMMISSIONER, LENIN CENTER, VIJAYAWADA.

5.DISTRICT COLLECTOR, GUNTUR DISTRICT, GUNTUR.

6.DISTRICT JOINT COLLECTOR AND CHAIRPERSON, MARKET
VALUE REVISION COMMITTEE, GUNTUR DISTRICT, GUNTUR

7.SPECIAL DEPUTY COLLECTOR CUM LAND ACQUISITION
OFFICER, UNIT NO. 15, RAYAPUDI -2, THULLUR MANDAL,
GUNTUR DISTRICT

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1.K S MURTHY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR REVENUE (AP)

2.GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV(AP)

3.S PRANATHI

The Court made the following Common Order:

In the present batch of writ petitions, the notifications issued under Section 11 (1) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (herein after referred to as 'Act') and the consequential proceedings pursuant to the said notifications etc; in respect of the subject matter lands are challenged, on various grounds.

2. However, without going into the merits of the case, all these writ petitions are disposed of with the consent of Mr. K S Murthy, learned Senior Counsel, Mr. Varun Byreddy, Mr. Sai Saran Chodisetty, Mr. V Surya Kiran Kumar and Mr. Shaik Mohammed Ismail, learned counsels appearing for the respective writ petitioners and the learned Advocate General, Mr. Dammalapati Srinivas, assisted by Smt. S Pranathi, learned counsel for CRDA/Special Government Pleader, in view of the memos filed on behalf of the respondent Nos.3 and 4, stating that in terms of G.O.Ms.No.205, Municipal Administration & Urban Development (CRDA.1) Department dated 07.10.2025, it was decided to withdraw the impugned notifications and issue afresh.

3. Heard Mr. K S Murthy, learned Senior Counsel, representing the petitioners. Also heard Mr. Dammalapati Srinivas, learned Advocate General, representing the respondents.

4. Referring to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Special Land Acquisition Officer, Bombay and others vs. M/s. Godrej and Boyce**¹, the learned Advocate General made submissions to the effect that similar provision i.e., Section 48(2) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 which is in para materia to Section 93(2) of the Act, 2013, was considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in the light of the expression in the said decision, the State Government is empowered to withdraw the impugned notifications. He submits that it is open to the petitioners to make appropriate claims before the

¹ (1988) 1 SCC 50

respondent No.5 for determination of compensation, if any, for the damage/loss suffered by them as a consequence of the impugned notifications and it is not a condition precedent that for withdrawal of the notifications, the amount of compensation should be determined and paid first.

5. He also submits that the petitioners cannot have any apprehension that they would be dispossessed from the subject matter lands, as only on passing of the appropriate awards, after issuance of fresh notifications, possession of the subject matter lands can be taken. He also submits that in the light of the decision referred to above, the State Government can proceed with the withdrawal of the impugned notifications.

6. In response to the same, it is stated on behalf of petitioners that the petitioners would file their respective claims before the respondent No.5 within a period of two (02) weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order and the respondent No.5 may be directed to decide the same after giving due opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, however, by fixing a time limit.

7. Recording the submissions made, these writ petitions are disposed of, leaving it open to the respondents to withdraw the impugned notifications and issue fresh notifications in respect of the subject matter lands. Further, if the petitioners submit their Claim Petitions to the respondent No.5 within the time stipulated by this Court, the same shall be dealt with in accordance with law, after affording reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioners and decided as expeditiously as possible, at any rate within a period of eight (08) weeks from the date of receipt of the said claims. No costs. Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, in these writ petitions shall stand closed.

JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

Date:08.12.2025
Ksj