

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH::AMARAVATHIMAIN CASE No: **WRIT PETITION No.31517 of 2025****PROCEEDING SHEET**

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
02	14.11.2025	<u>HN, J</u> 1. Sri P.Sri Raghu Ram, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner virtually online submits that the petitioner is aggrieved by the issuance of the notice dated 05.11.2025, whereby the 9th respondent has called upon the petitioner to explain the reasons for not cancelling the lay out permission granted to the petitioners. The impugned notice would refer to the letter of the Deputy Executive Engineer dated 10.02.2025 and the letter of the 2nd respondent dated 01.11.2025. 2. It is submitted that the property over which the petitioner formed a lay out was coming in the way of KC canal channel, as such permission to realign the same at the cost of the petitioner was sought from the competent authority. The competent authority has approved the proposal of the petitioner	

		on 17.09.2018. It is submitted that in pursuance of the said approval, the petitioner at his expenses realigned the canal channel and thereafter formed the lay out and sold the plots. 3. As the things stood thus, the 6th respondent has addressed a letter dated 30.09.2024 to the 2nd respondent duly informing that the KC canal lands were filled up with soil and sold as plots without permission and as such, the area would have to be kept under Section 22-A of the Registration Act. Challenging the same, the petitioner filed W.P. No.19570 of 2024 wherein this court granted interim direction leaving it open for the respondents to follow the due process of law. 4. The learned Senior Counsel submits that, instead of following the due process of law as contemplated, the respondents have now come up with the proposal of cancelling the realignment channel which was sanctioned on 17.09.2018 and now proposed to reclaim realignment canal. In that regard, the impugned proceedings have been issued. 5. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for the 9th respondent submits that on receipt of the remarks	
--	--	--	--

		from the Deputy Executive Engineer, KC canal and Executive Engineer, Water Resources Department, KC canal, the 9th respondent has issued notice. It is also submitted that it is only show cause notice issued to the petitioner and that the petitioner would have to submit his explanation. 6. The learned Assistant Government Pleader for respondents 5 to 8 submits that the petitioner has violated the conditions of canal channel realignment and has encroached into the canal. 7. Counters are to be filed. 8. In the meanwhile, there shall be stay of the impugned notice. 9. Post on 05.12.2025. JUSTICE HARINATH.N Note: Issue CC today. B/o. BV	
--	--	--	--