



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

[3208]

FRIDAY, THE FIFTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

WRIT PETITION NO: 33974/2025

Between:

1. DHARANIKOTA SURESH KUMAR, , S/O BHASKAR RAO, AGED
ABOUT 47 YEARS R/O 3-28, NAYUNIPALLI, VETAPALEM
MANDAL, BAPATIA DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY IT'S PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT
BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR.

2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, BAPATLA, BAPATLA DISTRICT.

3. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, CHIRALA , BAPATLA
DISTRICT.

4. THE THASILDHAR, VETAPALEM MANDAL, BAPATLA DISTRICT

...RESPONDENT(S):

The Court made the following ORDER:

1. This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following relief:

“to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of mandamus declaring the notice dated 20.11.2025 in Form-I, vide R.C.B. No. 913/2025 under Rule 3 (2) and 4 of the Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands Prohibition of Transfers Rules, 1977-issued by the 4th respondent calling upon the petitioner to submit his explanation as to why the land in an extent of Ac.4.24 cents in Sy. no's 433-1, 433-2, 433-8, and 433-9, Nayunipalli, Vetapalem Mandal, Bapatia District, shall not be resumed in view of long standing possession since 1976 as illegal, arbitrary and contrary to the settled principles of legal possession the procedure envisaged of Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands Prohibition of Transfers Rules, 1977 and Violative of fundamental and constitutional rights guaranteed to the petitioner under Article 14, 19 and 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently set aside the impugned notice dated 20.11.2025 in Form-1, vide R.C.B. No. 913/2025 and pass...”

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Stamps and Registration appearing for the respondents.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the notice dated 20.11.2025 issued in Form-I vide R.C.B. No. 913/2025 under Rules 3(2) and 4 of the Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Rules, 1977, by the 4th respondent, calling upon the petitioner to submit his explanation as to why the land admeasuring Ac.4.24 cents situated in Sy. Nos. 433-1, 433-2, 433-8 and 433-9 of Nayunipalli Village, Vetapalem Mandal, Bapatla District, should not be resumed, is illegal, arbitrary, and

contrary to the settled principles governing lawful and long-standing possession, particularly when the petitioner has been in continuous possession since 1976, and is also in violation of the procedure contemplated under the Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Rules, 1977.

4. He further submits that the impugned notice has been issued without complying the ratio laid down by this Court in *Dasari Narayana Rao v. Deputy Collector and Mandal Revenue Officer*¹ and others in W.P. Nos. 10933 and 10934 of 2006, rendering the notice unsustainable in law.

5. Considering the said submission and upon perusal of the impugned notice dated 20.11.2025 issued by the 4th respondent, this Court finds that the notice does not furnish full particulars relating to the alleged alienations. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed setting aside the impugned notice dated 20.11.2025 and the matter is remanded to the competent authority to issue a fresh notice furnishing all requisite particulars, strictly in accordance with the above-referred judgment. No costs.

Miscellaneous petitions pending if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE D. RAMESH

05.12.2025

klk

¹ MANU/AP/1305/2006

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

WRIT PETITION No.33974 of 2025

05.12.2025

klk