



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

WEDNESDAY, THE 9th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

WRIT PETITION NO: 43285 OF 2018

Between:

1. Duggirala Satyadev, S/o Late D.Parthasaradhi Aged about 63 years, Occ.
Business Presently R/o R/o 1712, Lina Drive, Gallup, NM-87301, USA

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, represented by Prl.Secretary, Municipal
Administration, Secretariate, Amaravathi.

2. The Commissioner, Vijayawada Municipal Corporation, Vijayawada.

...Respondents

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 appropriate writ or order or orders and more particularly in the nature of writ of Mandamus declaring action of the respondents in taking possession of the land without initiating land acquisition proceedings in respect of land admeasuring 3500 Sq.yards approximately situated at NTS No.3 and old No.18 (old unsurveyed block No.15/2). Block Nos.23 and 24 of ward No.28 situated in the Revenue ward No.16 of Machavaram (presently known as Karmikanagar), Eluru Road, Vijayawada as well as nonpayment of compensation as illegal and arbitrary and against to the principles of natural

justice and for a consequential direction to the respondents to initiate land acquisition proceedings and pay compensation to the petitioner and to pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2018

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 respondents to initiate land acquisition proceedings in respect of land admeasuring 3500 Sq.yards approximately situated at NTS No.3 and old No.18 (old unsurveyed block No.15/2), Block Nos.23 and 24 of ward No.28 situated in the Revenue ward No.16 of Machavaram(presently known as Karmikanagar), Eluru Road, Vijayawada for the purpose of payment of compensation to the writ petitioner during the pendency of the writ petition, in the interest of justice and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner: A RADHAKRISHNA

**Counsel for the Respondents: GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN
DEV(AP) Counsel for the Respondents:S.V.S.S.SIVARAM SC For VMC**

The Court made the following

ORDER:

The present Writ Petition came to be filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following relief:-

“... to issue appropriate writ or order or orders and more particularly in the nature of writ of Mandamus declaring action of the respondents in taking possession of the land without initiating land acquisition proceedings in respect of land admeasuring 3500 Sq yards approximately situated at NTS No 3 and old No 18 old unsurveyed block No 15/2 Block Nos 23 and 24 of ward No 28 situated in the Revenue ward No 16 of Machavaram presently known as Karmikanagar Eluru Road Vijayawadaas well as nonpayment of compensation as illegal and arbitrary and against to the principles of natural justice and for a consequential direction to the respondents to initiate land acquisition proceedings and pay compensation to the petitioner”

2. The petitioner's father and mother were the owners of land admeasuring Ac.2.09 cents in NTS No.3 and old No.18 (old unsurveyed Block No.15/2), Block Nos.23 and 24 of Ward No.28, situated in Revenue Ward No.16 of Machavaram, Eluru Road, Vijayawada. The said property was allotted to the share of the petitioner's father and mother pursuant to the judgment and decree dated 21.03.1971 passed in S.A. No.671 of 1968. The petitioner's father erected two thatched sheds on the said land. During his lifetime, the petitioner's father submitted a representation dated 03.07.1996 to the 2nd respondent requesting assessment of the property by allotting house numbers for the purpose of payment of property tax.

3. While the matter stood thus, without assessing the subject property, the 2nd respondent laid a public road and also erected electric poles over an extent of 3500 Sq. yards without initiating any land acquisition proceedings. The petitioner's father died on 04.01.2008 and his mother died on 01.02.1984. After their demise, the petitioner succeeded to the subject property. As the petitioner is a resident of the USA, he was not aware of the laying of the public road over the subject land. Therefore, the petitioner submitted a representation dated 03.07.2015 requesting the authorities to furnish the details of the extent of land acquired and the authority under which the land was acquired for laying the public road. In response thereto, the 2nd respondent, vide endorsement dated 01.08.2015, admitted that the public road had been laid, but failed to furnish the information regarding the land acquisition proceedings and the compensation payable to the petitioner. Aggrieved by the said action, the present Writ Petition has been filed.

4. The 2nd respondent filed a counter-affidavit admitting the facts stated by the petitioner. However, it is stated that the petitioner, having kept silent for 47 years from 1971 to 2018, approached this Court relying upon the alleged representation dated 03.07.1996, which is stated to be fabricated, as there is no seal or signature on the said representation. Except for the above contention, the 2nd respondent has not disputed the petitioner's ownership of the subject property.

5. It is an admitted fact that in pursuance of the representation made by the petitioner in the year 2015 requesting the details of the extent of land acquired by the respondent authorities and also with regard to the payment of compensation for the said extent, the following information was furnished to the petitioner vide endorsement dated 01.08.2015:

i) The said road has been laid long back in the interest of public under the authority vested to the Vijayawada Municipal Corporation under HMC Act 1955 affiliated to VMC.

ii) Under the authority vested to the Vijayawada Municipal Corporation under HMC Act 1955 affiliated to VMC.

iii) Rest of the information may be obtained from the Town Planning Section regarding ownership of the site.

6. It appears that thereafter the petitioner has not approached the concerned authorities for obtaining further information from the Town Planning Section regarding ownership of the site; instead of doing so, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of the present writ petition.

7. In view of the above, and also considering the fact that the writ petition is pending since 2018, instead of keeping the matter pending, this Court feels it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition by directing the petitioner to approach the concerned authority i.e., 2nd respondent by way of fresh representation seeking payment of compensation, duly enclosing the relevant documents in support of his ownership and title over the subject land. On

receipt of such representation, the 2nd respondent shall consider the same and take appropriate action in accordance with law.

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

As a sequel, Interlocutory Applications pending, if any, in this Writ Petition, shall stand closed.

Date: 09.09.2026
KGR/APSK

JUSTICE V.SUJATHA