
(2025) 10 AP CK 1105

In the Andhra Pradesh High Court, Amaravati

Case No : Writ Petition No: 27151 Of 2025

Vennapusa Chenna Reddy, S/O. Malyadri Reddy & Ors.

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of AP & Ors.

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 03-10-2025

Acts Referred:

Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands (Prohibition Of Transfers) Act, 1977 — Section 3
Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands (Prohibition Of Transfers) Rules, 2007 — Rule 3

Citation : (2025) 10 AP CK 1105

Hon'ble Judges : T.C.D. Sekhar, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Janardhana Reddy Ponaka

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

T.C.D. Sekhar, J

1. The petitioners claim that they are the absolute owners and possessors of land admeasuring an extent of Ac.4.00 cents in Sy.No.357-1; Ac.4.60 cents in Sy.No.300/2 (1st petitioner) and Ac.4.00 cents in Sy.No.357-2; Ac.4.36 cents in Sy.No.298/3 (2nd petitioner) situated at Chennipadu Revenue Village, Ponnaluru Mandal, Prakasam District. The petitioners further claim that initially the subject lands were held by their father and after his demise, they came into possession of the subject property. In support of their claim, the Pattadar Passbooks, Form 1B and Adangals are filed along with the writ petition to show that they are in possession and enjoyment of the lands in dispute. It is further case of the petitioners that while so, the respondent No.4 issued notice dated 29.08.2025 in Form-II under Rule 3 of Andhra Pradesh Assigned Lands (Prohibition of Transfers) Act, 1977 and the Rules made thereunder. It is further case of the petitioners that in response to the said notice, they claim to have submitted explanation on 08.09.2025. It is specifically averred in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition that despite submitting explanation dated 08.09.2025, without following the procedure contemplated under the Act 9 of 1977 and without passing orders

thereon, the respondent No.4 is trying to dispossess the petitioners from the subject lands. Questioning the said action, the present writ petition is filed.

2. On the other hand, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue would submit that the explanation offered by the petitioners is under consideration and the respondent No.4 is yet to pass order in the matter. He would further submit that the petitioners will not be dispossessed unless appropriate orders are passed pursuant to the notice dated 29.08.2025.

3. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue, this Court feels that it is appropriate to dispose of the writ petition directing the respondent No.4 not to dispossess the petitioners from the subject lands, except in accordance with law. It is needless to mention that respondent No.4 is directed to provide opportunity of being heard to the petitioners before passing orders in the matter. The said exercise shall be completed within a period of six (06) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

4. With the above directions, the present Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, Miscellaneous Petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.