

Date of reserved for orders : 04.05.2026

Date of pronouncement : 25.06.2026

Date of uploading : 03.07.2026

APHC010068372019



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

[3459]

THURSDAY, THE TWENTYFIFTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE SUMATHI JAGADAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 3076/2019

Between:

- 1.SREE TEJA AND TEJASREE DEVELOPERS, REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, K. MURALI KRISHNA REDDY, S/O. LATE SHANKAR REDDY, AGED .BOUT 46 YEARS, R/O. ROAD NO.13, APARNA SENOR VALLEY, H.NO.22, FILM NAGAR, HYDERABAD.
- 2.SREE AND SREE DEVELOPERS, A REGISTERED PARTNERSHIP FIRM,, REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING PARTNER, K. MURALIKRISHNA REDDY, S/O. LATE SHANKAR REDDY, AGED ABOUT 46 YEARS, R/O. ROAD NO.13, APARNA SENOR VALLEY, H.NO.22, FILM NAGAR, HYDERABAD.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

- 1.THE STATE OF AP, , REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI,

AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.

2.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT,
VISAKHIPATNAM.

3.THE TAHSILDAR, PENDURTHI MANDAL, VISAKHAPATNAM
DISTRICT.

4.THE SUBREGISTRAR, PENDURTHI, VISAKHAPATNAM.

5.THE DISTRICT REGISTRAR, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT AT
VISAKHAPATNAM.

...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 of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, to declare the action of the 2nd Respondent in directing the lands belonging to the Petitioners in extent of Ac.6.41 cents in Survey No.110/1A in Sowbhagyapuram village, Pendurthi Mandal, Visakhapatnam District to be included in the prohibited properties list and directing the 4th Respondent not to entertain any registrations/transfer of properties as being illegal, arbitrary, without jurisdiction, and in violation of Articles 14, 19, 21 and 300 - A of the Constitution of India and in violation of provisions of the Registration Act, 1908 and Consequently direct the 2nd Respondent to de-notify the lands belonging to the Petitioners in extent of Ac.6.41 cents in survey No. 110/1A in Sowbhagya puram village, Pendurthi Mandal, Visakhapatnam District from the list of Section 22-A (Prohibited Properties) and pass such other or further orders as are deemed fit and proper Prayer is amended as per the Order of this Court, Dt.10.05.2023 vide order passed in I.A.1 of 2023.

IA NO: 1 OF 2019

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased To direct the respondents to entertain, register and release the

sale deeds which may be executed by the petitioners in respect of the subject land admeasuring, pending disposal of the writ petition.

IA NO: 1 OF 2021

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to list the W.P.No.3076 of 2019 listed under caption "FOR BEING MENTIONED" for passing appropriate modification of the order dated 26.07.2021 passed by this Hon'ble Court where by the name of the counsel on record requires to be corrected with the printing of name of "Mr. N.Ashwani kumar" in the order in the description in the place of " Sri P.shashikiran" pending disposal of the above writ petition

IA NO: 1 OF 2022

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim order dated 26.07.2021 in I.A.No.1 of 2019 passed in W.P.No.3076 of 2019 and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2023

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to amend the main prayer in the above Writ Petition from "8. It is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ. Order or Direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring that the action of the respondents in not entertaining, registering and releasing sale deeds pertaining to the land admeasuring Ac. 10-44 cents in Sy.No,11011A and 110/1B of Sowbhagyarayapuram village, Pendurthi Mandal, VSP District on the ground that the said lands are prohibited for registration, is arbitrary, illegal and ultra-virus the provisions of the Registration Act and direct the respondents to forth with entertain and register sale deeds which may be executed and presented by the petitioner in favour of third parties and release them after due registration without reference to the provisions contained in Section 22A of the Registration Act. 1908 and grant such other relief as it deems fit in the circumstances of the case." To the

following: "For the reasons stated above, it is prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, to declare the action of the 2nd Respondent in directing the lands belonging to the Petitioners in extent of Ac.6.41 cents in Survey.No.110/1A in Sowbhagyapuram village. Pendurthi Mandal, Visakhapatnam District to be included in the prohibited properties list and directing the 4th Respondent not to entertain any registrations/ transfer of properties as being illegal, arbitrary, without jurisdiction, and in violation of Articles 14, 19, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and in violation of provisions of the Registration Act, 1908 and Consequently direct the 2nd Respondent to denotify the lands belonging to the Petitioners in extent of Ac.6.41 cents in survey No.110/1A in Sowbhagya puram village, Pendurthi Mandal, Visakhapatnam District from the list of Section 22-A (Prohibited Properties) and pass such other or further orders as are deemed fit and proper" pending disposal of the above Writ Petition and pass

IA NO: 2 OF 2023

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to permit the petitioner to implead the proposed respondent No. 6 to 9 herein as respondent No. 6 to 9 in the writ petition and pass

IA NO: 3 OF 2023

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the 2nd respondent to reconsider the application preferred by the Petitioners herein seeking de-notification of the subject land admeasuring Ac. 6.41 cents in Sy. No. 110/1A in Sowbhagyapuram Village, Pendurthi mandal from the list of prohibited properties notified under Section 22A of the Registration Act, 1906, pending disposal of the above Writ Petition and pass

IA NO: 4 OF 2023

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be

pleased to receive the additional material papers being filed along with this affidavit, pending disposal of the above Writ Petition and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1.N ASHWANI KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.ADDL ADVOCATE GENERAL (AP)

This Court made the following:

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 to declare the action of the 2nd respondent in directing the lands belonging to the petitioners in extent of Acs. 6.41 cents in Survey No.110/A in Sowbhagyarayapuram village, Pendurthi Mandal, Visakhapatnam District to be included in the prohibited properties list and direct the 4th respondent not to entertain any registrations/transfer of properties as being illegal, arbitrary, without jurisdiction, and in violation of Article 14, 19, 21 and 300-A of Constitution of India and in violation of provisions of the Registration Act, 1908 and Consequently direct the 2nd respondent to de-notify the lands belonging to the petitioners in extent of Ac. 6.41 cents in Survey No.110/A in Sowbhagyarayapuram village, Pendurthi Mandal, Visakhapatnam District from the prohibitory list under Section 22-A of the Registration Act and pass such other orders...."

2. In order to appreciate the controversy involved in the present writ petition, it is necessary to briefly advert to the relevant facts and the proceedings arising under the different enactments, which are set out hereunder.

3. Genealogy of the Parties and Nature of the Property:-

i) The property, which is the subject matter of the present writ petition, is in S.R. Puram Village, which was taken over by the Government under the Act No.XXVI of 1948. Subsequently, settlement operations were conducted and ryotwari settlement was introduced in accordance with law.

ii) Upon completion of the settlement operations referred to above, a Ryotwari Patta was granted and issued in favour of the original landholder, Sri Godavarthy Narayanacharyulu, a resident of Sowbhagyarayapuram Village, Pendurthi Mandal, Visakhapatnam District, under the provisions of the Act XXVI of 1948. The grant of the said patta was communicated through Lr. Dis. No. 935 of 1962, dated 28.02.1962. The patta covered a total extent of Acs.39.00 cents comprising Acs.24.56 cents in R.S.No.109, Acs.10.44 cents in S. No. 110/1, and Acs.4.00 cents in R.S. No.110/2. The said grant is duly reflected in the Settlement Register vide S.R.No. 56(1)10/67 VSP, dated 30.04.1970.

iii) The original owner, Sri Godavarthy Narayanacharyulu was survived by a sole daughter, Smt. Sita Ramanamma, who married K. Vijaya Raghavachari. Out of wedlock, a son, namely K. Narasimhacharyulu, was born who in turn fathered three children.

4. Ceiling Proceeding under the Land Reforms Act, 1973.

(i) Upon the commencement and enforcement of the A.P. Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973, proceedings for determination of the ceiling on agricultural holdings were initiated against the family unit. The Land Reforms Tribunal, by order in L.C.C.No.45 of 1975 dated 10.03.1976, computed the holding and determined that the declarant, Sri K. Narasimhacharyulu, was in possession of surplus land to an extent of Acs.10.33 cents.

(ii) Following the primary determination of surplus land, a statutory notification in Form-VI was issued by the competent authority, directing the declarant to surrender the excess land so determined. Aggrieved by the adverse order passed by the Land Reforms Tribunal, the declarant filed a statutory appeal before the Appellate Tribunal for Land Reforms, Visakhapatnam, vide L.R.A. No. 61 of 1976. The Appellate Tribunal, by its judgment dated 25.07.1977, modified the order of primary Tribunal and reduced the surplus land of the declarant to an extent of 6.41 cents.

(iii) Subsequently, the authorities issued a revisional notice canceling the previous orders issued under the relevant provisions on 01-07-1976. Physical possession of the surplus land was duly taken from the declarant on 08-10-1977.

(iv) One Sri Chetty Sudarshanam intervened by filing C.M.A.No.115 of 1978 in L.R.A.T. No. 12 of 1978. On 12.04.1978, an interim stay was granted restraining the distribution of the excess land to weaker sections. Subsequently, the appeal was allowed by order dated 11.09.1978.

(v) It was subsequently brought to the notice of the authorities that Sri Chetty Eswar Rao, who is son of Chetty Sudarshanam, had obtained a favourable order by suppressing the earlier orders passed in E.A.T. No. 10 of 1973 on the file of the District Judge, Visakhapatnam who is designated to hear the matter. The said order in E.A.T. No. 10 of 1973 explicitly established that Sri Chetty Eswar Rao could not legally assert any right or claim over the property and further held that his claim was not maintainable.

(vi) Subsequently, Sri K.P. Kumar, son of K. Narsimhacharyulu, filed an independent claim before the LRT-cum-RDO, Visakhapatnam, in LCC No. 45/1975/VSP, pursuant to Section 4(2) of the Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973.

(vii) Upon adjudication, the LRT allowed the said claim. The declarant was found to be a non-surplus landholder. Furthermore, the Tribunal ordered that an additional 1/5th of the standard holding be granted to each

eligible family member beyond the standard family unit, in addition to the single standard holding already permitted under the original computation.

(viii) Following the final determination that the declarant was a non-surplus landholder K. Narsimhacharyulu, the vendor executed a registered sale deed dated on 26.03.2008 and an extent of Acs.3.95 cents was conveyed in favour of the second petitioner under registered Document No. 868 of 2008.

(ix) Further on 05.11.2009 an extent of Acs.6.44 cents was conveyed under Document No. 2724 of 2009 in favour of the first petitioner.

(x) Notwithstanding the finality attained by the proceedings under the Land Reforms Act, the District Collector, Visakhapatnam, classified and included the subject property in the list of prohibited properties under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908.

(xi) Aggrieved thereby, the petitioners submitted a detailed representation to the District Collector seeking de-notification of the subject lands from the list of prohibited properties. However, the District Collector, by order dated 01.01.2019, rejected the said representation.

(xii) Aggrieved by the inclusion of the subject property under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908, the petitioners have filed the present writ petition.

5. PETITIONERS' SUBMISSIONS:-

(i) The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the subject property comprising an extent of Acs.10.44 cents situated in Sy.No.110/1A and 110/1B of Sowbhagyarayapuram village, Pendurthi Mandal, Visakhapatnam District is strictly private property.

(ii) It is further argued that the Tahsildar, 3rd respondent Pendurthi Mandal, duly recognised this private property by issuing Pattadar passbook Nos. 594252 and 594253. Furthermore, pursuant to the land conversion proceedings under RC.No.305/2011/A dt.29.04.2011, the Tahsildar, 3rd respondent, issued a statutory zeroithi certificate for the subject property.

(iii) Reliance is placed upon statutory certificate unequivocally certifies that the subject land is exempt from the provisions of the Agricultural Land Ceiling Act and constitutes private property, as clearly evidenced by the Revenue Record dated 29.04.2011.

(iv) It is urged that in the claim filed under Section 4(2) of The Andhra Pradesh Land Reforms (Ceiling on Agricultural Holdings) Act, 1973, before the Land Reforms Tribunal-cum-RDO of Visakhapatnam, the original vendors, namely Sri K.Narasimhacharyulu and his sons, were adjudicated as non-surplus landholders in the year 2007. Subsequently, the petitioners derived a valid, legal and enforceable title to the subject property from the aforementioned vendors through registered transfer deeds executed in the year 2008 and 2009.

(v) It is strongly argued that the 2nd respondent, District Collector, Visakhapatnam has completely bypassed the requisite legal procedure before listing the subject property under the prohibitory category under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, 1908. In this regard, the learned counsel placed reliance on Section 22-A 1 (e) and 2 of the Registration Act, 1908, which reads as under:

“22-A (1) (e): any documents or class of documents pertaining to the properties the State Government may, by notification prohibit the registration in which avowed or accrued interests of Central and State Governments Local Bodies, Educational, Cultural, Religious and Charitable Institutions, those attached by Civil, Criminal Revenue Courts and Direct and indirect Tax Laws and others which are likely to adversely affect these interest.

(2): For the purpose of clause (e) of sub-section (1), the State Government shall publish a notification after obtaining reasons for and full description of properties furnished by the District Collectors concerned in the manner as may be prescribed.”

(vi) His submission is that under the strict mandate of Section 22A (1) (e), the State Government can only prohibit registration by publishing a formal notification in the official gazette, accompanied by a full description of the properties and detailed reasons furnished by the concerned District Collector.

(vii) It is his contention that the respondents arbitrarily entered the petitioners' private lands in the prohibitory register without any such valuation, gazette notification, or adherence to the statutory prerequisite.

(viii) He further points out that, although the Land Reforms Tribunal declared the vendors as surplus holders as far back as 2007, the respondents chose to file a Land Reforms Appeal (LRA No. NIL/2020), after an unexplained and excessive delay of 5074 days.

(ix) Along with the belated appeal, the respondents filed I.A.No. 8 of 2023 seeking condonation of the delay, which was dismissed on 13-09-2023.

(x) It is submitted that, aggrieved by the dismissal, the respondents filed a Civil Revision Petition (CRP) before this Court and the same is pending adjudication.

(xi) It is urged that the respondents placed the property in the prohibitory register as a colourable exercise of power to circumvent the fact that they are completely barred by limitation from challenging the order of Tribunal in 2007.

(xii) The learned counsel contends that the respondents have willfully and deliberately failed to implead the petitioners as parties in either LRA No. nil of 2020 or the pending CRP before this Court.

(xiii) This omission persists despite having known since 1-1-2019 that the petitioners are the sole landowners. It is asserted that deliberately failing to include the petitioners, who are necessary and proper parties in the case, constitutes a clear violation of the principles of natural justice.

(xiv) Finally, he contends that, in the event of an arbitrary refusal by the registration department to record the deeds of conveyance, the petitioners approached this Court. Subsequently, interim orders were issued directing the respondents to provisionally accept and register the said documents pending final disposal of the matter. In view of the respondents' complete

non-compliance with the statutory procedures mandated by Section 22-A(1)(e) of the Registration Act, 1908, the petitioners request that the Writ Petition be allowed.

6. RESPONDENTS' SUBMISSIONS:-

(i) The learned Government Pleader for revenue submits that a portion of land measuring Acs.6.14 cents is legally vested with the State under the relevant Land Reforms Act.

(ii) The disputed land is in Survey Nos. 110/1a and 110/1b of Sowbhagyarayapuram. The title to the subject land is actively contested in WP No. 27297 of 2008, which is currently pending adjudication before this Court.

(iii) The property is further entangled in OS Nos. 365 of 2016 and 1647 of 2011, which are pending before the Principal Senior Civil Judge's Court and II Additional Senior Civil Judge's Court, Visakhapatnam respectively.

(iv) Due to the severe unresolved title dispute and ownership conflicts, the State has categorised the property to protect the same for public interest.

(v) The land stands formally notified and included in the prohibited property list pursuant to Section 22A of the Registration Act, 1908. Any

registration, transfer, or alienation of the subject land is strictly barred by law during the pendency of this dispute. The petitioners have shown no legal right or clean title in the property.

(vi) In the light of the finality of the order dated 25.07.1975 and the statutory bar under Section 22A, the respondents pray this Court to dismiss the petition.

7. RESPONSE TO THE RESPONDENTS' SUBMISSIONS:-

(i) The learned counsel for the petitioners, in his reply, contends that the petitioners are the bona fide purchasers for value, having acquired the subject property as early as the years 2008 and 2009.

(ii) The petitioners are strangers to the present litigation, having neither been a party to the ongoing proceedings nor to the civil suits. Accordingly, the petitioners should not be subjected to any prejudice, civil consequences, or hardships arising from the dispute between third parties.

(iii) It is his case that subsequent to the absolute purchase, the competent revenue authorities, specifically the Tahsildar, 3rd respondent had duly issued pattadar passbooks in favour of the petitioners.

(iv) The petitioners continue to hold a settled, undisturbed, and lawful interest in the subject land. Therefore, the respondents' action of placing

the property on the prohibitory list solely on the basis of pending litigation is entirely unjustifiable.

(v) The learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the respondent authorities have abruptly awakened from a deep slumber, seeking to file an appeal before the LRAT after an inordinate, gross, and unpardonable delay of more than 5000 days (over 14 years), without any plausible justification, which cannot be countenanced in law. Furthermore, since the petitioners cannot be penalised for gross laches and delayed action on the part of the respondents, finally, he prays that the writ petition may be allowed.

8) Heard Sri N. Ashwani Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners, the learned Government Pleader for Revenue, and the learned Government Pleader for Stamps & Registration appearing for the respective respondents. The material available on record has also been perused.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS:-

9. The following questions arise for consideration in the present Writ Petition:-

i) **Whether the application filed under Section 4(2) of the Act by the legal heirs of the vendors before the Land Reforms Tribunal is**

maintainable as an independent proceeding without challenging the appellate order dated 25.07.1976?

a) The respondents contend that the appellate order dated 25.07.1976 operates as a complete bar against any subsequent proceedings before the Tribunal. However, this contention is based on a misunderstanding of the statutory scheme. The application filed under Section 4(2) of the Act was not intended to review or reopen the issues decided in the appellate proceedings of 1976. On the contrary, it was founded on a distinct and independent set of facts, namely that the entire family unit and its members were not brought on record in the earlier proceedings.

b) Under Section 4 of the Act, determination of the family unit constitutes the foundation for calculating the ceiling area and identifying surplus land. Since the rights and interests of the entire eight-member family unit were never brought on record or adjudicated upon the proceedings of 1976, the determination of the ceiling area was incomplete and factually deficient.

c) In such circumstances, the legal heirs of the vendors were fully entitled to approach the competent authority seeking rectification of the said omission.

d) The omission gave rise to a fresh and independent cause of action. There was no statutory requirement compelling them to challenge the

appellate order dated 25.07.1976 through a separate appeal, since the said order did not consider or adjudicate upon the actual composition of the family unit. Consequently, the Tribunal was fully justified in entertaining the proceedings in L.C.C. No.45 of 1975, Visakhapatnam, and in passing the order dated 23.06.2007 holding that the declarant was not a surplus holder.

ii). Whether the State's claim of continuous control and physical possession over the subject land is sustainable against the petitioners?

a) The State's assertion that the subject land continues to remain under its control is directly contradicted by its own official acts and revenue records. Pursuant to the order dated 23.06.2007 passed by the Land Reforms Tribunal, the competent Revenue Authority, namely the Tahsildar, recognized the petitioners' title and possession in the year 2011. Pattadar Pass Books, Title Deeds and other consequential revenue entries were issued in favour of the petitioners. The Tahsildar also permitted conversion proceedings in respect of the subject land. These official acts clearly establish that the State itself recognized the petitioners' title and possession.

b) Further, in I.A. No.1 of 2019, this Court directed release of the registered document in favour of the petitioners, subject to the result of the present writ petition. These circumstances clearly demonstrate that the petitioners are in peaceful, continuous and exclusive possession of the property. Ordinarily, a Court would not direct release of original title documents in favour of a person who is not in possession.

c) It is also significant that the respondents accepted the order dated 23.06.2007 for more than a decade. Only in the year 2020 they filed L.R.A. No.Nil of 2020, along with I.A. No.8 of 2020 seeking condonation of delay. The appeal was thus sought to be filed after an unexplained delay of about 14 years (5074 days). Upon dismissal of the delay condonation application, the State preferred a Civil Revision Petition before this Court, which is still pending consideration. The pendency of the said CRP, by itself, cannot prevent this Court from examining and deciding the present writ petition on its own merits.

d) More importantly, it is an admitted fact that the petitioners were never impleaded as parties in L.R.A. No.Nil of 2020. Even in the pending Civil Revision Petition, the petitioners have not been made parties and the proceedings continue only against the original vendors. The law on this aspect is well settled. Any judicial or administrative order passed behind

the back of a person whose rights are directly affected, without impleading such person and affording an opportunity of hearing, is void and unenforceable against such person.

e) The respondents remained inactive for more than thirteen years and sought to challenge the order dated 23.06.2007 only in the year 2020. Such extraordinary and unexplained delay cannot be lightly condoned. Therefore, the respondents cannot be permitted to unsettle rights that have already accrued in favour of the petitioners.

f) Further, since the petitioners were never impleaded in either the appellate proceedings or the pending Civil Revision Petition, any order passed therein cannot legally bind the petitioners or adversely affect their registered rights over the subject property.

iii). Whether the conditional removal of the subject land from the prohibitory list maintained by the Revenue Divisional Officer is legally sustainable?

This Court takes serious exception to the conduct of the Revenue Divisional Officer during the pendency of the present writ petition. The Revenue Divisional Officer removed Acs.4.03 cents of land from the prohibitory list, but made such removal condition upon the petitioners

withdrawing the present writ petition. Such action on the part of a statutory authority is wholly impermissible. Access to justice and the right to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot be subjected to conditions imposed by executive authorities. The State and its officers cannot use administrative powers as a means to compel citizens to abandon pending legal proceedings.

10. In view of the findings recorded above, the principal grounds raised by the respondents cannot be sustained. The order dated 23.06.2007 passed under Section 4(2) of the Act was a valid exercise of statutory power based upon a fresh and independent cause of action. The petitioners' possession and title have also been recognized by the State itself since the year 2011.

11. Accordingly, I find that the land purchased by the petitioners in Sy.No.110/A covering an area of Acs.6.41 cents, which is classified as prohibited property under Section 22-A of the Registration Act, is unlawful and arbitrary. Therefore, I direct the District Collector to issue orders for de-notification of this property within eight weeks of receiving a copy of this order. Upon such removal, the Sub-Registrar, the 4th respondent, shall accept, register, and record the petitioners' document in accordance with established legal procedures.

12. With the above direction, the Writ Petition is allowed. No order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE SUMATHI JAGADAM

25th June, 2026
cbs

Whether the order is:

Speaking	--	Reasoned	√
Reportable	--	Non-Reportable	√

THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE SUMATHI JAGADAM

WRIT PETITION No.3076 of 2019

25th June, 2026

cbs