



**HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH**  
MONDAY ,THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY ONE

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE M.SATYANARAYANA MURTHY**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 21478 OF 2021**

**Between:**

1. Tamarana Annayya Babu, S/o.Late Kannan Naidu  
Aged about 52 years, Occ Cultivation  
R/o.LBP Agraharam (Village), Buchaiahpet Mandal  
Visakhapatnam District.

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**AND:**

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary,  
Revenue Department  
Secretariat, Velagapudi,  
At Amaravathi, Guntur District, A.P.
2. The District Collector Visakhapatnam District Visakhapatnam
3. The Tahsildar Buchaiahpet Mandal  
Visakhapatnam District.

**...RESPONDENTS**

**Counsel for the Petitioner(s): MADHU SUDHAN P**

**Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR REVENUE**

**The Court made the following: ORDER**



**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.SATYANARAYANA MURTHY**

**WRIT PETITION No.21478 OF 2021**

**ORDER:**

This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking the following relief:

“.....to issue a Writ, Order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of mandamus declaring the action of the Respondent No 2 and 3 in failing to grant D-Form Patta to the petitioner for his longstanding possession over the Government Poramboke land in Sy.No.93/1 and 93/2, (Gramakantam) to an extent of Ac.0.67 cents situated at LBP Agraharam Village, Buchaiahpetta Mandal, Visakhapatnam District, inspite of confirming the long standing possession of the petitioner by various courts and without considering the representations made by the petitioner dt. 16.03.2020 and 16.04.2021 as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional and against the provisions of Board Standing orders and consequently direct the respondents to consider and grant the D-Form Patta to the petitioner for the above mentioned land by duly considering his long standing possession and enjoyment of the said land and pass such other orders....”

2. Though the petitioner made several allegations against the respondents, during the course of hearing learned counsel for the petitioner requested this Court to issue a direction to the respondents to dispose of the representations dated 16.03.2020 and 16.04.2021 submitted by the petitioner, without touching the merits of the case.

3. Learned Government Pleader for Revenue appearing for respondents readily agreed to dispose of the representations dated 16.03.2020 and 16.04.2021 submitted by the petitioner, if any pending with the respondent authorities.

4. In view of the submission of Government Pleader for Revenue appearing for respondents, I need not decide the truth or otherwise of the allegations made in the petition.



5. This Court is conscious that no such direction be issued in view of the judgment of the Apex Court in ***The Government of India v. P.Venkatesh***<sup>1</sup>, wherein the Apex Court held that such orders may be passed for a quick or easy disposal of cases in overburdened adjudicatory institutions but, they do not serve to the cause of justice. As the learned counsel for the petitioner himself requested to issue a direction to dispose of the representations dated 16.03.2020 and 16.04.2021 submitted by the petitioner, I find no other alternative except to issue such direction.

6. In the result, Writ Petition is ***disposed of***, directing the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent/ Tahsildar to dispose of representations dated 16.03.2020 and 16.04.2021 submitted by the petitioner, in accordance with law, within four (04) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall also stand closed.

---

**JUSTICE M. SATYANARAYANA MURTHY**

Date: 27.09.2021

KK

---

<sup>1</sup> 2019 (8) SCALE 544



**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.SATYANARAYANA MURTHY**

**WRIT PETITION NO.21478 OF 2021**

Date: 27.09.2021

KK