



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

[3330]

**TUESDAY, THE TWELFTH DAY OF AUGUST
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

**PRESENT
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO**

WRIT PETITION No. 20342 of 2025

Between:

1. SOMISETTY SUBBARAYUDU, S/O GURUNADHAM, AGED 85 YEARS, RYO. 26TH LANE, SANTHI NAGAR, KADAPA, KADAPA DISTRICT.
2. YARRAGOLLA BALAGOPAL,, S/O PEDHA KRISHNAIAH, AGED 52 YEARS, R/O. VIDYANAGAR, BADVEL MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.
3. YARRAGOLLA NAIDU,, S/O. GOPAIAH, AGED 58 YEARS, R/O. B.C.COLONY, KAMALAKUR VILLAGE, ATLUR MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.
4. YERRAGOLLA VENKATAMMA,, W/O. LATE GOPALU, AGED 60 YEARS. R/O. VIDYANAGAR, BADVEL MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT
5. YERRAGOLLA PITCHAMMA,, W/O. NAIDU, AGED 52 YEARS, R/O. KAMALAKUR VILLAGE. ATLUR MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.
6. THOKA LAKSHMI DEVI,, W/O. VENKATA SUBBAIAH, AGED 45 YEARS, R/O. VIDYA NAGAR, BADVEL MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.
7. EDALA LAKSHUMAIAH,, S/O. PEDDA KONDAIAH, AGED 60 YEARS, R/O. SIVARAMAKRISHNA NAGAR, BADEVEL MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.
8. BODDUBOYANA LAKSHUMMA,, W/O. KRISHNAIAH, AGED 45 YEARS, VIDYANAGAR, BADVEL MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.
9. SINGAMMAGARI GOPALU, , S/O. GOPAIAH, AGED 72 YEARS. R/O. SIVARAMAKRISHNA NAGAR, BADVEL MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.
10. BODDUBOYANA RAJA,, S/O. KRISHNAIAH, AGED 40 YEARS,

R/O. VIDYANAGAR, BADVEL MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.

11. BODDUBOYNA SUBBAMMA,, W/O. GANGUIAIAH, AGED 55 YEARS, R/O. VIDYANAGAR, BADVEL MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.
12. BODDUBOYNA YANADAMMA., W/O. LATE LAKSHMAIAH, AGED 58 YEARS, R/O. VIDYANAGAR, BADVEL MANDAL. KADAPA DISTRICT.
13. BODDUBOYNA ADILAKSHMAMMA,, W/O. LATE KRISHNAIAH, AGED 60 YEARS, R/O. RAMANJ INAGAR, BADEVEL MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.
14. GAMPA SUBBAMMA, , W/O. VENKATAIAH, AGED 65 YEARS, R/O. BC COLONY, KONDURU VILLAGE, ATLUR MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.
15. BODDUBOYNA LAKSHMAMMA,, W/O. RAJA, AGED 50 YEARS. R/O. VIDYANAGAR, BADVEL MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT.
16. BODDUBOYNA VENKATAMMA,, S/O. W/O. SANTAIAH, AGED 65 YEARS. R/O. VIDYANAGAR, BADVEL MANDAL. KADAPA DISTRICT

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, KADAPA DISTRICT AT KADAPA.
3. THE SPECIAL COLLECTOR LA, GALERU NAGARI SRUJALA SRAVANTHI(GNSS) KADAPA, KADAPA DISTRICT.
4. THE SPECIAL DEPUTY COLLECTOR LA, TELUGU GANGA PROJECT- UNIT -II, KADAPA, KADAPA DISTRICT.
5. THE CHIEF ENGINEER, NTR TELUGU GANGA, TIRUPATI, TIRUPATI 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 3rd and 4th respondent in not referring petitioners claim for determination of compensation under Section 64 of The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act,

2013 in spite of petitioners due request to that effect by a representation dated 18.06.2025 as illegal, irregular, arbitrary, violative of the provisions of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and rules framed thereunder and offends articles 14, 21 and 300-A of Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to refer petitioners claim for determination of market value and compensation for their acquired landed property in different survey numbers situated at Jonnavaram Village, Atloor Mandal, Kadapa District to the Competent Authority pursuant to Award No.3/2015-16 dated 20.03.2015 passed by the 4th respondent and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. NAVULURU KRISHNA SAI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR LAND ACQUISITION

2. GP FOR IRRI AND CAD

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

Pithily, this Writ Petition is filed on the grounds that representation dated 18.06.2025 made to the authorities, but it was not addressed. Therefore, it is urged that the respondents be directed to address the representations, as such direction would suffice in the circumstances of the case.

2. In the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in *The Government of India vs P. Venkatesh* reported in (2019) 15 SCC 613 held that:

Dispose of the representation' mantra is increasingly permeating the judicial process in the High Courts and the Tribunals. Such orders may make for a quick or easy disposal of cases in overburdened adjudicatory institutions. But, they do not service to the cause of justice. The litigant is back again before the Court, as this case shows, having incurred attendant costs and suffered delays of the legal process. This would have been obviated by calling for a counter in the first instance, thereby resulting in finality to the dispute.

3. This Court is not oblivious of the fact that a Court to authorities, before directing "consideration" of a claim or representation should examine whether the claim or representation is with reference to a "live" issue or whether it is with reference to a "dead" or "stale" issue. If it is with reference to a "dead" or "stale" issue or dispute, the Court/tribunal should put an end to the matter and should not direct consideration or reconsideration. If the Court to Tribunal deciding to direct "consideration" without itself examining the merits, it should make it clear that such consideration will be without prejudice to any contention

relating to limitation or delay and laches. Even if the Court does not expressly say so, that would be the legal position and effect."

4. Disposal of proceedings by seemingly innocuous orders directing consideration of representation though result in quick or easy disposal of cases in overburdened adjudicatory institutions, but such orders do more disservice than service to the cause of justice.

5. However, the respondents are directed to consider the petitioner's representation, examine the same thoroughly, issue orders accordingly, and communicate the decision to the petitioner. It goes without saying that the entire process will be completed within six weeks from the date the order is received.

6. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, Interlocutory Applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO

Date: 12.08.2025

siva

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO

WRIT PETITION No.20342 of 2025

Date: 12.08.2025

siva