



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI

[3558]

FRIDAY, THE THIRTIETH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY

AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

WRIT APPEAL No.1151 of 2025

Between:

1. J.CHAKRAPANI REDDY, S/O J.VENKATAMUNI REDDY, AGED 58 YEARS R/O 1-80, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
2. J.VIJAY PRAKASH, S/O J.NARAYANA REDDY, AGED 74 YEARS R/O 3-177, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
3. V.HEMAANTH KUMAR, S/O V.SOMASEKHAR, AGED 29 YEARS, R/O 4-39, SIDDAREDLAPALLI VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
4. S.K.RANI, W/O (LATE) J.SOMSUNDAR, AGED 48 YEARS R/O DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
5. J.RAVINDRA PRASAD, S/O J.NARAYANA REDDY, AGED 72 YEARS, R/O DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
6. J.PUSHPA, W/O J.CHAKRAPANI REDDY, AGED 52 YEARS, R/O 1-80, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

7. L.SUSHI, W/O L.NAGABUSHANA REDDY, AGED 48 YEARS
R/O 3-135B, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM
MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
8. D.C.SRINIVASULU, S/O DARA CHINNAIAH, AGED 57
YEARS, R/O 2-744-4, GANDHIPURAM, P AND T COLONY,
MADANAPALLI, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
9. J.JAYA SANKAR REDDY, S/O J.NARAYANA REDDY, AGED
54 YEARS, R/O 1-81, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE,
SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
10. D.VENKATA REDDY, S/O VENKATARAMI REDDY, AGED 66
YEARS R/O 3-104, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE,
SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
11. V.SOMASEKHAR, S/O V.MUNIYAPPA, AGED 49 YEARS,
R/O 4-39, SIDDAREDLAPALLI VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM
MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
12. SILPAVATHI, W/O V.VIJAY KUMAR, AGED 36 YEARS, R/O
159, SIDDAREDLAPALLI VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM
MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
13. VENKATAPPA, S/O (LATE) BAJJAPPA, AGED 75 YEARS,
R/O SIDDAREDLAPALLI VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM
MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
14. S.SIDDAPPA, S/O MARDAPPA, AGED 77 YEARS, R/O
SIDDAREDLAPALLI VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL,
CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
15. M.HARISH GOWD, S/O M.VENKATAMUNI GOWD, AGED 29
YEARS, R/O 4-1, SIDDAREDLAPALLI VILLAGE,
SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
16. PAPANNA, S/O SIDDAPPA, AGED 40 YEARS, R/O 2-26,
SIDDAREDDYPALLI VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL,
CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
- 17.. SUBBAMMA, W/O (LATE) VENKATAMUNI, AGED 64
YEARS, R/O 4-1, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE,

SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

- 18.D.RAMAKRISHNA REDDY, S/O D.VENKATA RAMA REDDY, AGED 69 YEARS R/O 3-104, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
- 19.NARAYANAPPA, S/O MUNIVENKATAPPA, AGED 64 YEARS, R/O SIDDAREDDYPALLI VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
- 20.SULOCHANAMMA, W/O M.VENKATAMUNI, AGED 49 YEARS, R/O 2-4, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
- 21.S.K. PADMAMMA, W/O S.K.SUBRAHMANYAM, AGED 44 YEARS, R/O SIDDAREDDY PALLY VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
- 22.VENKATAMUNI, S/O MUNIVENKATAPPA, AGED 59 YEARS, R/O DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
- 23.K.SOMASEKHARA REDDY, S/O K.SUBBA REDDY, AGED 58 YEARS, R/O 3-75, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
- 24.THIPPAKKA, W/O (LATE) NETHAPPA, AGED 50 YEARS, SIDDAREDDY PALLI VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
- 25.SANKARAPPA, S/O RAMAPPA, AGED 86 YEARS, R/O 4-30, SIDDAREDLAPALLI VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
- 26.K.JAYAPPA, S/O (LATE) BAJJI GOWDU, AGED 59 YEARS, R/O 1-40, SIDDAREDDY PALLI VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
- 27.J.JANARDHAN, S/O J.VENKATAMUNI REDDY, AGED 52 YEARS, R/O 1-77, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

28.J.NAGALAKSHMAMMA, W/O (LATE) J.VENKATAMUNI REDDY, AGED 87 YEARS R/O 3-176, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

29.G.THIPPANNA, S/O GANTTAPPA, AGED 51 YEARS, R/O DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

30.J.HARI PRASAD, S/O J.VENKATAMUNI REDDY, AGED 51 YEARS, R/O 3-176, DANDIKUPPAM VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

...APPELLANT(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE AND LAND ACQUISITION, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR AND DISTRICT MAGISTRATE, CHITTOOR DISTRICT, CHITTOOR.
3. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, KUPPAM, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
4. THE TAHSILDAR, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
5. THE TAHSILDAR, RAMAKUPPAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
6. THE ANDHRA PRADESH AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED, REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, MANGALAGIRI.
7. THIPPAKKA, W/O (LATE) RAMCHANDRAPPA, AGED 59 YEARS, R/O SIDDAREDDY PALLY VILLAGE, SHANTIPURAM MANDAL, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
8. BHULAKSHAMMA, W/O KITTAPPA, AGED 47 YEARS, R/O APPIKONDENAHALLI VILLAGE, THIMMARAVATHANAHALLI,

KOLAR, KARNATAKA STATE, PIN - 563136. (RESPONDENT NO. 7 AND 8 ARE NOT NECESSARY PARTIES IN WRIT APPEAL)

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Appellant(S):

1. K S MURTHY ASSOCIATES

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. ADVOCATE GENERAL

The Court made the following:

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA**

WRIT APPEAL No.1151 of 2025

JUDGMENT: *(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice Cheekati Manavendranath Roy)*

The unsuccessful writ petitioners are the appellants in this writ appeal. They have filed the writ petition in W.P.No.28691 of 2025 to set aside the Notifications dated 16.08.2025 issued by the District Collector, Chittoor District, to acquire the lands for public purpose and also seeking direction to the respondents therein to furnish the information sought for by them to enable them to file objections relating to the said Notifications.

2. The said writ petition was dismissed by the learned single Judge by order dated 24.10.2025. Aggrieved thereby, the writ petitioners preferred the present writ appeal.

3. We have heard Mr. K.S. Murthy, learned Senior Counsel appearing for M/s. K.S. Murthy Associates for the appellants, and learned Advocate General for the respondents.

4. The parties will be referred as they are arrayed in the writ petition.

5. Facts of the writ petition lie in a narrow compass and may be stated as follows:

The State Government of Andhra Pradesh proposed to construct an airport at Kuppam Village in Chittoor District for public purpose. The District Collector has issued four notifications to acquire the lands for the said public purpose of constructing an airport. An extent of

Ac.150.00 cents is part of the lands sought to be acquired by the Government for the said purpose of constructing an airport under the aforesaid Notifications. All the said Notifications were issued under Section 11 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (for short, 'the Act'). The appellants sought to set aside the said Notifications mainly on three grounds viz., 1) it is not clarified whether the land that is proposed to be acquired is suitable for construction of an airport, 2) no justification is offered as to whether the said land is acquired for public purpose or not and 3) the findings of the Social Impact Assessment Report are not furnished to the writ petitioners, as required under Section 15 of the Act, to enable the writ petitioners to submit their objections relating to the proposal made for acquiring the said lands.

6. It is the grievance of the writ petitioners that no information relating to the said three requirements is furnished to them to enable them to submit their objections. Therefore, while praying to set aside the impugned Notifications on the aforesaid grounds, the writ petitioners also sought direction to the respondents to furnish the said information to enable them to file their objections.

7. The learned single Judge, by the impugned order, dismissed the writ petition on the ground that the information relating to the environmental permission and other technical issues cannot be sought by the writ petitioners even for the purpose of submitting their objections. However, the learned single Judge has granted liberty to the writ petitioners to file their objections within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of the order and directed the authority concerned to give an opportunity of hearing to the writ petitioners and then to decide the objections.

8. Aggrieved thereby, the writ petitioners have preferred the present writ appeal as noticed supra.

9. When this writ appeal came up for admission before a Coordinate Bench of this Court on 03.11.2025, after hearing both the learned Senior counsel appearing for the writ petitioners/appellants and the learned Advocate General, the said Bench has passed an elaborate interim order. All the contentions raised by the writ petitioners have been dealt with in the said interim order. Ultimately, the Coordinate Bench has directed the respondent authorities to furnish information relating to the total extent of the land which would be utilized for the construction of the airport and such other information that the authorities do not consider to be sensitive or confidential information, within three days from the date of the said order, and directed the writ petitioners to submit their objections on or before 19.11.2025 and directed the authorities to take a decision on the objections raised by the writ petitioners and furnish a copy of the said decision to the writ petitioners. Liberty was also granted to the writ petitioners to challenge the decision that may be taken by the authorities concerned on the objections raised by them.

10. The Coordinate Bench further directed the respondents to file their counter-affidavit in the instant writ appeal within four weeks. Accordingly, the respondents have filed counter-affidavit and the writ petitioners/appellants have also filed their reply-affidavit.

11. Pursuant to the said directions given by the Court on 03.11.2025, the respondent authorities have furnished the information relating to the total extent of the land which would be utilized for construction of the airport, to the writ petitioners. The said fact is admitted by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the writ

petitioners. The writ petitioners have also filed their objections, as ordered by the Bench, before the respondents.

12. According to the submissions made by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the writ petitioners/appellants, as only part of the information sought for was furnished to the writ petitioners, they cannot file their detailed objections and still the information relating to technical sanction, administrative sanction and other clearances is to be furnished and that the writ petitioners/appellants would file their detailed objections after receipt of the said information.

13. Section 15 of the Act deals with the right of persons interested in any land that was notified under Section 11 of the Act to submit objections relating to the notification and the proposed acquisition. As per the said provision, the objections shall be confined only to three grounds which are clearly enumerated in clauses (a) to (c) under sub-section (1) of Section 15 of the Act i.e., (a) the area and suitability of land proposed to be acquired, (b) justification offered for public purpose and (c) the findings of the Social Impact Assessment Report. Thus, strictly speaking, the objections relating to the notification shall be confined only to the aforesaid three grounds enumerated in Section 15 of the Act, as permitted by the legislation.

14. As regards the first ground is concerned, which relates to the area and suitability of the land proposed to be acquired, the respondents have already furnished the information relating to the total extent of the land and the area at which the land is proposed to be acquired, to the writ petitioners. Therefore, if the writ petitioners got any objection relating to the said area identified for construction of the airport and suitability of the land proposed to be acquired, they can as

well submit their objections on it to the authorities concerned, as the information relating to the same has already been furnished to them.

15. As regards the second ground relating to the justification offered for public purpose is concerned, as the land is sought to be acquired for the purpose of constructing an airport, it goes without saying that the justification relating to the public purpose for which the land is sought to be acquired has been made clear by the State. As an airport is meant for use of public for their conveyance and transport to various places across the country and also to foreign countries, it is undoubtedly meant for public purpose. It is well settled law that the State, under the doctrine of "eminent domain", is authorized to acquire private lands for public purpose. So, in exercise of the said power conferred on the State under law, the State has now proposed to acquire the lands in question for the said public purpose. If the writ petitioners are of the opinion that there is no justification for acquiring the land for the said public purpose, they can submit the same in their objections that are to be filed by them. Ultimately, it is for the respondent authorities to take a final call on it and answer the said objection.

16. As regards the third ground relating to the findings of the Social Impact Assessment Report is concerned, Section 10-A of the Act enables and empowers the Government to exempt certain projects from the purview of the said requirement of submitting any such Social Impact Assessment Report. In exercise of the said power conferred on the Government under Section 10-A of the Act, the Government has exempted the present project from the requirement of submitting the Social Impact Assessment Report, by way of issuing a Notification to that effect. The writ petitioners did not challenge the said Notification on any valid legal ground. The same is already observed by the

Coordinate Bench in the earlier order dated 03.11.2025 referred to above. Therefore, it is not open to the writ petitioners to seek information relating to the said Social Impact Assessment Report, as the requirement of submitting such Report is exempted under the Notification issued by the Government, which is not challenged.

17. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that the relevant information required by the writ petitioners for the purpose of submitting their objections, as contemplated under Section 15 of the Act, has been adequately furnished to the writ petitioners. The information relating to the detailed project report and technical sanctions is not the necessary information required to be furnished to the writ petitioners for the purpose of submitting their objections on the aforesaid grounds enumerated in Section 15 of the Act. In fact, the learned single Judge has clearly held in the impugned order that the said technical sanctions and environment permissions are not required to be furnished to the writ petitioners for the purpose of submitting their objections.

18. We do not find any legal flaw or infirmity in the impugned order of the learned single Judge warranting interference in this appeal. Therefore, the impugned order of the learned single Judge is perfectly sustainable under law and the same is not liable to be set aside.

19. As the necessary information relating to the extent of the land and the area identified for constructing the airport has been furnished to the writ petitioners and as it is stated that they have already submitted their objections, if at all they intend to file any further objections, they are at liberty to submit the same by 02.02.2026. As already directed by this Court in the earlier order, the respondents shall take into consideration such objections and take a decision on it

according to law. The decision so taken on the objections raised by the writ petitioners shall be communicated to the writ petitioners.

20. The writ appeal is dismissed subject to the above directions.

As a sequel, interlocutory applications, if any pending, in this case shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY

JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

Date: 30.01.2026

Note:-

Issue CC by tomorrow.

(B/o)

IBL

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY

AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

WRIT APPEAL No.1151 of 2025

Dt: 30.01.2026

IBL