



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

[3525]

TUESDAY, THE SIXTH DAY OF MAY  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO**

**THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE K MANMADHA RAO**

**WRIT APPEAL NO: 577/2025**

**Between:**

K Srilatha and Others

**...APPELLANT(S)**

**AND**

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

**...RESPONDENT(S)**

**Counsel for the Appellant(S):**

1. V VINOD K REDDY

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1. GP FOR LAND ACQUISITION

**The Court made the following Order:** *(per Hon'ble Sri Justice R. Raghunandan Rao)*

Heard Sri V. Vinod K. Reddy, learned counsel for the appellants  
and the Learned Advocate General appearing for the respondents.

2. In view of the interlocutory orders passed by this Court, in  
W.A.No.483 of 2025, dated 06.05.2025 and in view of the pendency of  
W.P.No.6042 of 2012, there shall be an interlocutory order, as follows:

- 1) The question of: Whether the inclusion of the District Collector, in  
the definition of appropriate government, in Rule 2(b) can be treated as a

notification under the proviso to section 3(e), empowering the District Collector to discharge the functions of the appropriate government, shall be referred to a Full Bench, for an authoritative pronouncement.

2) The further acquisition process, under challenge, shall not continue, during the subsistence of the interim order of the Learned Single Judge, of the erstwhile High Court of Andhra Pradesh, dated 06.03.2012, in W.P.No.6042 of 2012.

3) The issue of whether the land in question is double wet crop land nor the issue whether such double wet crop land can be acquired has been considered by the Learned Single Judge, and the same can be agitated before the Learned Single Judge, for purposes of interim directions, by way of a fresh application.

4) Subject to direction No.2, and direction No.3, the acquisition proceedings may be carried on. However, if there is a finding by the Full Bench, in favour of the Appellant, that the notification and declaration issued by the District Collector was without jurisdiction, the entire acquisition proceedings shall be treated to have lapsed and the respondents would have to initiate fresh proceedings, for purposes of calculating the compensation payable to the appellant, by taking the date of the new declaration as the date for fixing compensation. Any payment that would be made under the award proceedings, in the present

acquisition, shall be set off against the compensation, payable, if any, under the fresh proceedings.

5) If it is found that the Award, relied upon by the respondents, has been passed within 30 days of the date of publication of the public notice, under Section 21 of the Act, the said Award would be disregarded, and as per the submission of the Learned Advocate General, a fresh Award would have to be passed.

**R. RAGHUNANDAN RAO, J.**

**DR. K. MANMADHA RAO, J.**

BSM