



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

[3330]

**THURSDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO
WRIT PETITION NO: 28698/2025**

Between:

1. KALTIREDDY LAKSHMI, W/O. SUBRAHMANYAM,
R/O. VARAGALI VILLAGE, CHILLAKUR MANDAL, TIRUPATI
DISTRICT

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, REP. BY ITS PRI. SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPT., SECRETARIAT, AMARAVATHY
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
TIRUPATI DISTRICT, TIRUPATI
3. THE JOINT COLLECTOR, TIRUPATI, TIRUPATI DISTRICT
4. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, GUDUR, TIRUPATI
DISTRICT
5. THE TAHSILDAR, MANDAL REVENUE OFFICE, KOTA,
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 issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction declaring action of the Revenue Authority in taking different stand in survey number 70 of Siddavaram village for mutation and of 1-B against the land in respect of an extent of Ac. 2-00 cents in Sy. issuance No. 70 P of Siddavaram village, Kota mandal, Tirupati district In favour of the petitioner as illegal, arbitrary, without jurisdiction and violative of principles of natural justice and consequently take action against the erring officers by summoning the revenue record In the above said survey number 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 to direct the 3rd Respondent to dispose appeal filed against the order of Revenue Divisional Officer passed in D.Ds(B2)765/2022 dated 16-07- 2022 against the land to an extent of Ac. 2-00 cents in Sy. No. 70-P of Siddavaram village, Kota mandal, Tirupati district and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. THOTA RAMAKOTESWARA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR REVENUE

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO
WRIT PETITION No.28698 of 2025

ORDER:-

The present Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following relief:

“...to issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction declaring action of the Revenue Authority in taking different stand in survey number 70 of Siddavaram village for mutation and issuance of 1-B against the land in respect of an extent of Ac.2-00 cents in Sy.No.70-P of Siddavaram village, Kota mandal, Tirupati district, in favour of the petitioner as illegal, arbitrary, without jurisdiction and violative of principles of natural justice and consequently take action against the erring officers by summoning the revenue record in the above said survey number and pass such other order or orders....”

2. Petitioner is owner of the property to an extent of Ac.2.00 cents in Sy.No.70-P of Siddavaram Village, Kota Mandal, in pursuance of Vyavasaaya Bhoomi Appaginthi Patta on 14.07.2009. Since then, petitioner has been in peaceful possession and enjoyment of the subject property. Petitioner also filed an application for mutation of subject land in revenue records. However, the Tahsildar *vide* proceedings dated 26.03.2022 rejected the request for mutation. Against the orders of Tahsildar, appeal is filed before the Revenue Divisional Officer, Gudur. The Revenue Divisional Officer dismissed the appeal. Thereafter, petitioner preferred revision before the Joint Collector, Tirupati, which remains unnumbered.

3. Heard Sri T.Ramakoteswara Rao, learned counsel for petitioner and learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue for respondents.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that by not numbering the revision petition, the 3rd respondent has rendered the remedy illusory. The appellate authority is bound to consider and dispose of the revision in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible. The delay in numbering and deciding the revision amounts to a violation of Article 14 of the Constitution of India, and the petitioner's right to property is protected under Article 300A of the Constitution of India. The failure to adjudicate the stay petition and the statutory revision amounts to a violation of the principles of natural justice. Hence, learned counsel prays to direct the respondent authorities to number and dispose of the revision petition, including the stay petition, in accordance with law and within a reasonable time.

5. Learned Assistant Government Pleader submits that stay application, if any, filed in revision petition will be decided in accordance with law and as expeditiously as possible.

6. Ergo, this Court directs the 3rd respondent-revisional authority to make an endeavor, or to put to an end, by making all the efforts, in deciding the interlocutory application in the revision with due diligence within a reasonable time, on merits and as per law, after hearing all the parties to the dispute, as expeditiously as possible and in any case, not beyond three (03) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy this order. If there is no interlocutory application pending in the revision, the 3rd respondent is directed to dispose of the revision petition itself

within a period of two (02) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. With the above directions, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

Date: 23.10.2025
KBN

JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO