

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE No.: W.P.No.33954 of 2025

PROCEEDING SHEET

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
01.	05.12.2025	<u>DR, J</u> Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for the respondents. The contention of the petitioner is that the respondent authorities have colluded with the unofficial respondent and are attempting to mutate the name of the unofficial respondent in the revenue records. It is alleged that, on the strength of such mutation by virtue of an agreement with the 5th respondent, the respondents are effecting the said mutations behind the back of the petitioner, without issuing any notice, and are altering the petitioner's name and substituting it with that of the unofficial respondent. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further brought to the notice of this Court that identical issues had fallen for consideration before the Full Bench of the erstwhile High Court of the combined State of Andhra Pradesh in Chinnam Pandurangam v. Mandal Revenue Officer, Serilingampally Mandal, reported in (2007)	

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		6 ALD 348. In view of the above judgment rendered by the Full Bench, this Court held that notice in Form-VIII under the relevant provisions has to be issued to the individuals or affected persons also. In the present case, it is contended that no such notice has been served on the petitioner. In view of the above, the respondent authorities are directed to maintain status quo with respect to the revenue records and not to create any third-party interest. The learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to take out personal notice to the respondent Nos.5 to 11 through RPAD and file proof of service before the registry. Post the matter after four (04) weeks. DR, J KLK	

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE