

Date of reserved for orders :

Date of pronouncement : 29.06.2026

Date of uploading : 10.07.2026

APHC010542802023



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

[3332]

MONDAY, THE 29th DAY OF JUNE 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

WRIT PETITION NO: 29816/2023

Between:

1. ALLU SANYASAMNNA, W/O LATE RAMUNAIDU, AGED 67 YEARS,
R/O 1-119, POTHANAPALLI, SRUNGAVARAPUKOTA,
VIZIANAGARAM- 525145.

...PETITIONER

AND

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

2. THE JOINT COLLECTOR, VIZIANAGARAM, VIZIANAGARAM
DISTRICT.

3. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, VIZIANAGARAM,
VIZIANAGARAM DISTRICT.

4. THE TAHSILDAR, SRUNGAVARAPUKOTA, VIZIANAGARAM,
VIZIANAGARAM DISTRICT.

5. KILAPARTHI ARASAVILLAMA, , W/O LATE GANGA SURYA
APPARAO, AGED 76 YEARS, R/O 1-85, JAMI MANDALAM,
THANDRANGI KOTTAM, VIZIANAGARAM DISTRICT - 535148.

6. KILAPARTHI SATYARAO, , S/O APPARAO AGE NOT KNOWN TO
THE PETITIONER, R/O POTHANAPALLI VILLAGE, S. KOTA,

VIZIANAGARAM 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 MANDAMUS declaring the action of the Respondent No.4 in not mutating the petitioner name in the revenue records and issuing Pattadar passbook for the land Ac. 3.11 cents in R.S. No. 73/2 situated at Pothanapalli Village, S.Kota Mandal, Vizianagaram District and remove it from dispute register by implementing the Appeal Order Rc.No.474/2019 A, dated 14.08.2019 passed by Respondent No.3 and Revision Order Rc.No.3302/2018/SDT-I/KRRC, dated 25.12.2022 passed by the Respondent No.2 is bad, illegal, arbitrary, discriminatory, contrary and violation of principle of natural justice and violating the Articles of constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents No.4 to mutate the petitioner name in revenue records and to issue Pattadar passbook for the land Ac. 3.11 cnts in R.S. No. 73/2 situated at Pothanapalli Village, S.Kota Mandal, Vizianagaram District and to pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2023

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 Respondent No.4 to inriplement the Appeal Order Rc.N. 474/2019 A, dated 14.08.2019 passed by Respondent No.3 to issue Pattadar passbook to the petitioner for the land Ac. 3.11 cnts in R.S. No. 73/2 situated at Pothanapalli Village, S.Kota Mandal, Vizianagaram District, pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.K V ADITYA CHOWDARY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR REVENUE

2.G RAMA GOPAL

The Court made the following order:

Aggrieved by the action of the respondents in not mutating the petitioner's name in revenue records and issuing pattadar passbook for the subject land admeasuring Ac.3.11cents in R.S.No.73/2 situated in Pothanapalli village, S.Kota Mandal, Vizianagaram District, the present writ petition is filed.

2. Heard Sri Ch.Madhava Raman, learned counsel representing learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri G.Ramgopal, learned counsel for the 5th respondent and Sri Venkata Narayana, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner while reiterating the contents of the writ affidavit submitted that, the petitioner is the absolute owner of the subject land and against the mutation made in favour of the 5th and 6th respondents herein with respect to subject land, the petitioner preferred appeal before the 3rd respondent and the appeal was partly allowed on 14.08.2019 directing the tahsildar to issue pattadar passbook to the petitioner with regard to the subject property and also to remove the subject land from the dispute register. He further submitted that the said orders were further upheld by the Joint Collector in the revision vide orders dated 25.12.2022. He further submitted that, inspite of the said orders, the authorities have not mutated the petitioner's name in the revenue records nor issued pattadar passbook and kept the matter pending, as such, the petitioner made an application dated 15.03.2023 but the authorities have not acted so far. He further submitted that, it would suffice if a direction is

given to the authority concerned to pass orders on the application made by the petitioner in a time bound manner.

4. Sri G.Ramgopal, learned counsel for the 5th respondent contended that, the orders dated 14.08.2019 & 25.12.2022 of the appellate authority and revisional authority are in favour of the 5th respondent only and the petitioner without approaching the tahsildar, directly filed the present writ petition which is not maintainable and accordingly prayed to dismiss the writ petition.

5. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue submitted that, he has information that the authorities has passed an endorsement on the petitioner's application dated 15.03.2023 by passing an endorsement dated 29.03.2023.

6. In reply, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that, no such endorsement was passed nor served to the petitioner and that it was still pending.

7. Perused the record and considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for respective parties.

8. As against the mutation made in favour of the 5th and 6th respondents herein, the petitioner preferred an appeal which was allowed directing the tahsildar to issue pattadar passbook to the petitioner with regard to the subject property and also to remove the subject land from the dispute register and the same was upheld by the Revisional authority, Joint Collector and confirmed the

orders of the Revenue Divisional Officer. Pursuant to the said orders, the petitioner made an application dated 15.03.2023 for mutating his name in place of the 6th respondent with respect to subject land. The record would show that the no notice was served on the 6th respondent. However, as no positive orders are being passed affecting the rights of the 6th respondent, hearing the 6th respondent does not arise.

9. A perusal of the record would disclose that, an endorsement dated 29.03.2023 was passed on the petitioner's application, which was placed on record but there was no acknowledgment evidencing its service on the petitioner. Therefore, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, with the consent of the learned counsel for the petitioner, this court is inclined to dispose of the writ petition with the following direction:

The tahsildar is directed to serve the endorsement dated 29.03.2023 to the petitioner within one (01) week from the date of receipt of copy of this order. Upon receipt of the same, if the petitioner has any grievance against the same, she can approach the appropriate authority in accordance with law.

Accordingly, the writ petition is ***disposed of***. No costs.

Miscellaneous applications, pending if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

29.06.2026
BRS

Whether the order is :

Speaking Yes/No / Reasoned Yes/No

Reportable Yes/No / Non-Reportable Yes/No