



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

[3330]

**TUESDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 16330/2023

BETWEEN:

1. GALIVEETI VENKATA RAMI REDDY, S/o NARAYANA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS, OCC: COOLIE, R/o. DOOR No.9/13,
CHITLURU VILLAGE, H/o. NARAYANAREDDYGARIPALLE,
RAMAPURAM MANDAL, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT, ERSTWHILE
YSR KADAPA DISTRICT

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,
REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, AMARAVATHI,
GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT,
RAYACHOTY, ERSTWHILE YSR KADAPA DISTRICT.
3. THE TAHSILDAR, RAMAPURAM MANDAL, ANNAMAYYA
DISTRICT, ERSTWHILE YSR KADAPA DISTRICT.
4. THE VILLAGE REVENUE OFFICER, CHITLURU VILLAGE,
RAMAPURAM MANDAL, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT, ERSTWHILE
YSR KADAPA DISTRICT.
5. GALIVEETI BABU REDDY, S/o. RAMANJULU REDDY, AGED
ABOUT 45 YEARS, OCC: CULTIVATION, R/o. CHITLURU
VILLAGE, H/O. NARAYANAREDDYGARIPALLE, RAMAPURAM
MANDAL, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT, ERSTWHILE YSR KADAPA
DISTRICT.
6. GALIVEETI RAMANJULU REDDY, S/O CHINNA GANGIREDDY,
AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS, OCC: CULTIVATION, R/o. CHITLURU
VILLAGE, H/O NARAYANAREDDYGARIPALLE, RAMAPURAM
MANDAL, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT, ERSTWHILE YSR KADAPA
DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT(S):

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 a Writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the 2nd respondent not consider the petitioner's representation, dated 05.12.2022 pertaining the petitioner's property an extent of Ac.0-60 cents in survey No.625/1 and an extent of Ac.0-90 cents in survey no.625/2 total outcome an extent of Ac.1-50 cents of Chitluru Village, Ramapuram Mandal, Kadapa District, is as illegal, arbitrary, unjust and violative of Fundamental Right guaranteed to the petitioner under Article 21 of the Constitution of India and violative of Constitutional right of the petitioner under Article 300-A of Constitution of India and consequently direct the 2nd respondent to consider the petitioner's representation, dated 05-12-2022 pertaining the petitioner's property an extent of Ac.0-60 cents in survey No.625/1 and an extent of Ac.0- 90 cents in survey no.625/2 total outcome an extent of Ac.1-50 cents of Chitluru Village, Ramapuram Mandal, Kadapa District, and pass such other order or orders.

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.SANAGA ASHOK KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The Writ Petition is filed to declare the action of the 2nd respondent in not considering the petitioner's representation dated 05.12.2022 pertaining to the petitioner's property to an extent of Ac.0-60 cents in Survey No.625/1 and an extent of Ac.0-90 cents in survey No.625/2, total admeasuring to an extent of Ac.1-50 cents, situated at Chitluru village, Ramapuram Mandal, Kadapa District, as illegal, arbitrary, unjust and violative of fundamental rights guaranteed under the Article 21 of the Constitution of India and also violation of Article 300A of the Constitution of India and prayed to direct the respondents to consider and address the representation dated 05.12.2022.

2. This Court has disposed of one Writ Petition No.21758 of 2025 directing the respondents therein to examine the representation/application thoroughly, issue orders accordingly and communicate the decision to the petitioners vide order dated 30.08.2025. Against the said order, an intra Court appeal vide W.A. No.1184 of 2020 was filed, and a Division Bench of this Court allowed it and set aside this Court's order in the above said writ petition irrespective of the reason given, in view of the Appellate Court's decision and although the prayer in the present Writ Petition is innocuous, this Court is not interested for disposal of the Writ Petition, to consider the representation.

3. The Supreme Court has deprecated practice of disposal of the representation, stating that it is increasingly permeating the judicial process in the High Courts and the Tribunals. Such orders may make for quick or easy disposal of cases in overburdened adjudicatory institutions. But they do not serve to the cause of justice. In view of the order of the Supreme Court, the innocuous prayer prayed by the petitioner in the Writ Petition for disposal of the representation is hereby rejected.

4. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHARA RAO

Date: 23.12.2025

Harin

54

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO

W.P.No. 16330 OF 2023

Date: 23.12.2025

Harin