

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH :: AMARAVATI

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

WRIT PETITION No.1599 OF 2023

Between:-

K.R.Subramanyam
and another

... Petitioners

and

State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Guntur District
and others

... Respondents

Counsel for petitioners : Mr.Butta Vijaya Bhaskar

Counsel for respondents: The G.P. for Revenue

ORDER:

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue appearing for the respondents.

2. The writ petition is filed aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the 2nd respondent in deleting the land in Survey Nos.556, 567 and 569 admeasuring Acs.11.00 situated at Momidi Village, Chillakuru Mandal, Tirupathi District, from the Prohibited Category List published under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908. They also seek a direction to the

respondents to receive and register the sale deeds submitted by the petitioners in respect of the subject matter property.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners, while referring to the material filed along with the writ petition, submits that though the petitioners made Meeseva application dated 15.11.2019 seeking deletion of the subject matter property from the Prohibited Category List, no action was taken by the Revenue Authorities and in such circumstances, the petitioners made a representation on 29.9.2022 to the District Collector i.e., the 2nd respondent and despite the same, no action is taken in the matter. She submits that under the said circumstances, the petitioners are constrained to approach this Court seeking appropriate reliefs.

4. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, on the other hand, submits that the petitioners appear to have made application seeking deletion of the subject matter property from the Prohibited Category List, before bifurcation of the Districts and that might be the reason for delay in taking any action on the petitioners' application and representation. He, however, submits that if the petitioners make appropriate application afresh, the 2nd respondent would

be in a position to take necessary action in accordance with law.

5. In view of the said submission, this Court deems it appropriate not to examine the matter further and deems it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition, giving liberty to the petitioners to make a fresh application to the 2nd respondent seeking deletion of the subject matter property from the Prohibited Category List. On filing such application, the 2nd respondent shall pass orders thereon, in accordance with law, after giving due opportunity to the petitioners, as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the application.

6. With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

NINALA JAYASURYA, J

January 25, 2023.

vasu