



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

**[3206]**

WEDNESDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF APRIL  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO**

**WRIT PETITION Nos.36069, 33944 & 34043 /2017**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 36069/2017**

**Between:**

1.T.A.P KASTURI RANGAN, S/O. LATE KRISHNAMACHARI, AGED- 58  
YEARS, OCC- SENIOR ASSISTANT, R/O. 401, SAI NIKITHA  
RESIDENCY, SHANTI NAGAR, KHADI COLONY, TIRUPATHI- 517  
501

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

- 1.PRL SECY REV DEPT 5 ORS, REVENUE DEPARTMENT,  
AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT. A.P
- 2.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR CHITTOOR CHITTOOR DISTRICT A P,
- 3.THE SUB COLLECTORCUMLAO, TIRUPATHI, CHITTOR. CHITTOR  
DISTRICT.
- 4.THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER TIRUPATI CHITTOR  
DISTRICT, -
- 5.UNION OF INDIA REP BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER, SOUTH  
CENTRAL RAILWAYS, RAIL NILAYAM, SECUNDERABAD.
- 6.SENIOR DIVISIONAL ENGINEER, SOUTH CENTRAL RAILWAY,  
DIVISION OFFICE, WORKS BRANCH, GUNTAKAL, CHITTOOR  
DISTRICT. AP

**...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, order or direction preferably a writ in the nature of Mandamus to declare the action of the respondents in awarding compensation to the petitioner on reduced market value of his acquired land admeasuring 129.228 Sq.yards in Sy. No. 207/1 an extent of Ac. 0.56.00, Sy. No. 207/2 an extent of Ac. 0.01.00 and in Sy. No. 207/3B an extent Ac. 0.34, situated at Rayala cheruvu Road, Gopalraju colony, Tirupathi in Ward No.19 Block No.7 after issue of Preliminary Notification No.62/2015 dated 20.07.2015 despite Petitioner's objections to the acquisition dated 20.11.2015 and insertion of including all benefits in the enquiry statement by the respondents without his knowledge is illegal and consequently direct the respondents to pay 100% solatium on the compensation paid under Section 30 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 with interest from the date of acquisition of the land

**IA NO: 1 OF 2017(WPMP 44815 OF 2017)**

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 award the compensation with 100% solatium on the market price of Rupees 30,000/- as per provisions of The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 which was prevailing on the date of issuance of Preliminary Notification No.62/2015 Form-VI (A) dated. 20-07-2015 with interest from the date of acquisition of the land, pending disposal of the above writ petition

**IA NO: 4 OF 2017(WPMP 207522 OF 2017)**

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

**IA NO: 1 OF 2025**

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 grant leave to the petitioner herein / Respondent No.4 in WP No.36069/2017 to file counter affidavit

**IA NO: 1 OF 2026**

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 Pleased to grant leave to the petitioner herein to file and to receive reply to counter affidavit and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1.T L KRISHNA PRASAD

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

1.GP FOR REVENUE (AP)

2.GP FOR LAND ACQUISITION

3.DEPUTY SOLICITOR GENERAL OF INDIA

4..

**Date of Reserved : 27.02.2026**

**Date of Pronouncement : 08.04.2026**

**Date of Upload : 08.04.2026**

**The Court made the following Common Order:**

As the three Writ Petitions arise out of the same requisition proceedings and raise the same issue, they are being disposed of by way of this common order.

2. Heard Sri T.L. Prasad, learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Land Acquisition for the respondents.

3. The Indian Railways had sought, as part of the expansion and modernization of the Tirupati Railway Station, to acquire certain extents of land situated in Sy.No.190/1A1B2; Sy.No.190/1A1C as well as Sy.Nos.207/1, 207/2, 207/3B of Tirupati.

4. Upon a requisition being made, to that effect, by the Indian Railways, the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent, initiated acquisition proceedings. The preliminary notification, under Section 11(1) of the Act 30 of 2013 was published in the Gazette on 20.07.2015. Under this notification, Ac.0-48 cents in Sy.No.190/1A1C and Ac.0-267 cents in Sy.No.190/1A1B2 belonging to the writ petitioner in W.P.No.34043 of 2017; Ac.0-56 cents in Sy.No.207/1; Ac.0-01 cent in Sy.No.270/2 and Ac.0-34 cents in Sy.No.207/3B belonging to the writ petitioner in W.P.No.36069 of 2017 were included in this notification. In the course of the said acquisition, the respondent authorities, on the ground that the petitioners in W.P.No.34043 of 2017 and 36069 of 2017, had given

consent for passing consent Award, were awarded compensation, in relation to these lands at the rate of Rs.30,000/- per square yard.

5. The petitioners in these writ petitions being aggrieved by the said compensation have approached this Court, by way of these writ petitions. The contention of the writ petitioners, in all these cases, is that the market value of the land, in the above survey numbers, according to the Basic Value Register is Rs.30,000/- per square yard and consequently, compensation that should have been paid to the petitioners should have been calculated on the basis of the above market value. However, the total compensation payable to the petitioners was fixed at the rate of Rs.30,000/- per Sq. yard, which is clearly impermissible.

6. It appears that during pendency of W.P.No.34043 of 2017, the writ petitioner therein had passed away and his wife and daughter have been brought on record as his legal representatives. Apart from this, the wife and the daughter of the deceased writ petitioner in W.P.No.34043 of 2017 have filed a separate writ petition in W.P.No.33944 of 2017.

7. The respondents have filed their counter-affidavits. In the counter-affidavit, the stand taken by the respondents is that the value of the land, which was sought to be acquired from the petitioners, as per the Basic Value Register was only Rs.10,000/- per square yard and the comparable sale deeds also did not show any great variation from this figure, consequently, compensation paid out to the petitioners was a fair and reasonable

compensation. Apart from this, the petitioners in W.P.Nos.34043 & 36069 of 2017 are said to have consented for passing of such awards by way of signing the necessary consent forms.

8. The petitioners in the above two Writ Petitions disputed this contention. The contention of the petitioners is that the signatures on the consent forms are their signatures. However, these signatures were obtained, under a false pretence, by assuring the petitioners that compensation would be paid to them by taking the market value of the land, i.e., Rs. 30,000/- per sq. yard. However, the respondent authorities after giving such assurance had gone back on that assurance and had fixed compensation itself as Rs.30,000/- per Sq. yard and the same is a clear case of fraud perpetrated on the petitioners therein.

9. The petitioners in W.P.No.33944 of 2017 on the other hand would contend that, they had a share in the land shown in the name of Sri T. Krishna Reddy, and the consent given by Sri T. Krishna Reddy, even it was treated as proper consent, would not in any manner bind the petitioners in W.P.No.33944 of 2017.

10. The petitioners to demonstrate that the value of the land, in question was Rs.30,000/- per Sq. yard at the relevant point of time had relied upon the minutes of the Market Value Revision Committee and the revised values fixed under the Market Value guidelines with effect from 01.08.2015. In the table set out in the said guidelines, Ward No.19, Block No.7 which had the

original market value of Rs.30,000/- per Sq. Yard of “commercial land” was reduced to Rs.15,000/- with effect from 01.08.2015 and the value of “residential land” was maintained at Rs.10,000/- per square yard. The petitioners contend that the reduction of market value for this block is not only unreasonable but unrealistic and done primarily to ensure that the petitioners do not get proper value for their land. The petitioners point out that the market value of all the other wards and blocks were increased and it is only Ward No.19, Block No.7 where the market value is reduced. The petitioners would also contend that the reduction also would not have any effect on the compensation payable to them as the preliminary notification was issued on 20.07.2015 when the market value for this area was Rs.30,000/- per Sq. yard and the valuation was only changed from 01.08.2015. It is contended that it is the market value available on the date on which preliminary notification is issued that would be relevant for the calculation of compensation.

11. The respondents while reiterating the aforesaid contention of consent being given by the petitioners, also contend that the land of the petitioners does not fall under Ward No.19, Block No.7. To counter this contention, the petitioners have applied to the Deputy City Planner, Tirupati Municipality, for correlation of the Ward and Block numbers with the revenue and town survey numbers. The Deputy City Planner has furnished necessary information, by proceedings, dated 06.01.2026. In these proceedings, the Deputy City Planner states that there is no Town Survey number available in relation to Ward No.19, Block no.7. However, the revenue survey number

corresponding to this Ward and Block are Sy.Nos.190, 195 to 198, 200, 201, 208 and 209.

12. The petitioners in W.P.No.34043 of 2017 contend that the land of the petitioners, even according to the preliminary notification falls in Sy.No.190 which falls within the Ward No.19, Block No.7 and the market rate would have to be taken at the rate of Rs.30,000/- per Sq. yard. As far as the petitioner in W.P.No.36069 of 2017 is concerned, it is contended that the market value in relation to all the other areas in different wards and blocks is comparable and the same rate would have to be paid to the petitioners in W.P.No.36069 of 2017.

13. The learned counsel for the petitioner would also contend that the market value of the very same land which had been reduced to Rs.15,000/- per Sq. yard with effect from 01.08.2015 was increased to Rs.33,000/- per Sq. yard on 28.02.2017 which shows that the reduction of Rs.15,000/- was an artificial reduction.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF THE COURT:-**

14. The land acquisition proceedings, for acquisition of the lands in question commenced on 20.07.2015 with a notification under Section 11(1) of the Act 30 of 2013. The compensation, payable under such acquisition, would be calculated either on the basis of the value of these lands, on 20.07.2015, under the basic value register maintained by the registration authority or by looking at the comparable sales, in the area, whichever is higher.

15. In the present case, the petitioners in W.P.Nos.33944 & 36069 of 2017, had given their consent for acquisition of the land and payment of compensation. The petitioners in W.P.No.33944 of 2017, who are the wife and daughter of the petitioner, in W.P.No.34043 of 2017, contend that their consent was not taken. The record does not show that such consent was obtained from these two petitioners. However, their names along with their bank account details, were included in the consent forms, signed by the petitioner in W.P.No.34043 of 2017. Further, they had also received compensation, apportioned between the petitioner in W.P.No.34043 of 2017 and themselves.

16. The basic contention of the petitioners is that the market value of the land, in question in the Basic Value Register was Rs.30,000/- per Sq. yard and the question of the petitioners agreeing for a compensation of Rs.30,000/- per Sq. yard is incomprehensible as the minimum compensation that would have to be awarded to the petitioners would be in excess of Rs.60,000/- per Sq. yard.

17. The petitioners, with view to demonstrate this contention, had placed before this Court the minutes of the meeting of the market value revision committee, in which the values fixed under the market value guidelines, had been revised, with effect from 01.08.2015. The petitioners would draw the attention of this Court to the market value fixed for Ward No.19, Block No.7. The said minutes shows that the market value revision committee while either, maintaining the same rates or increasing the rates for

all other locations, had reduced the market value, in relation to this area, from Rs.30,000/- per Sq. yard to Rs.15,000/- per Sq. yard for commercial land while, retaining the market value of residential land at Rs.10,000/- per Sq. yard. This rate was to come into effect from 01.08.2015.

18. The petitioners contend that the authorities being aware of the huge amount of compensation they would have to pay out, had deliberately reduced the value of the land, in the basic value register, only for this area with effect from 01.08.2015. The petitioners would also point out that the value of this area was increased to Rs.33,000/- per Sq. yard, as on 28.02.2017 which fortifies their case that the value was deliberately reduced in order to deprive the petitioners of their just compensation.

19. The Counter affidavit filed by the respondents, is silent and does not deny the allegations of the petitioners. The respondents, while not answering these contentions took the stand that the value of the land in question was Rs.10,000/- per Sq. yard as per the Basic Value Register. It is further contended that the land in question does not fall under the Ward No.19, Block No.7. Though, the respondents had made this specific contention, they have not stated as to where the land in question would be located in terms of Wards and Blocks. This issue has become relevant as the acquisition proceedings refer to revenue survey numbers, while the Basic Value Register refers to Wards and Blocks.

20. The acquisition notifications were issued in terms of the revenue survey numbers, mentioned above. As the correlation between the revenue survey numbers and Ward & Blocks numbers was not available, the petitioner had filed an application on the Right to Information Act, for such information. The Deputy City Planner, Tirupati by proceedings, dated 06.01.2026, had replied to the Right to Information query. In this reply, it was stated that the land in ward No.19, block No.7 would correspond to the land in Sy.Nos.190, 195 to 198, 200, 201, 208 & 209. The land in question, in W.P. No. 36069 of 2017, falls in Sy.Nos.207/1, 270/2 & 207/3B. The respondents have not produced any documents or correlation to show where the land is located, in terms of the Ward and Block numbers are concerned.

21. As noted above, the value of the land in Ward No.19, Block No.7, which corresponds to Sy.No.190, as on 20.07.2015, was fixed at Rs.30,000/- per Sq. yard, The respondents while contending that the value of the land in the Basic Value Register, was Rs.10,000/- per square yard, have not submitted any document, including the relevant extracts of the basic value register of the area. There are no details available as to the ward and block corresponding to Sy.Nos.207/1, 270/2 & 207/3B. The respondents have not chosen to place any material before this Court as to the basis for taking the value of the land to be Rs.10,000/- per square yard, in the Basic Value Register. In the counter affidavit filed by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent, a table setting out the value of land, according to the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent, as per the Basic Value register has been set out. In this table, it is stated that the value of land

categorized as “Railway quarters” and “Ellappareddy Quarters” is Rs.10,000/- per square yard, if it is residential and Rs.15,000/- per square yard, if it is Commercial. It is not stated anywhere, if the land in question is residential or commercial. From the valuation adopted, the respondents have treated the land to be residential. However, this is in direct contrast to the communication between Sub-Registrar Tirupati, and the Senior Section Engineer (works) South Central Railway. The Senior Section Engineer, by letter, dated 08.06.2013, had requested the Sub-Registrar to set out the value of the land, proposed to be acquired. In reply, the Sub-Registrar, by his letter dated 11.06.2013, had stated as follows:

“REGISTRATION AND STAMPS DEPARTMENT

From,  
K. Mohan Babu,  
Sub Registrar,  
Tirupati.

To  
The Senior Section Engineer(Works)  
South Central Railways,  
Tirupati.

Letter No Nil Date 11-6-2013

Sir.

Sub: Land value particulars for acquisition of 1.83 acres of land at Southern side of Rallway Station-furnished-Regarding.

Ref: letter No. Nil dated 8-6-2013 of Sr.Section engineer (Works),

Tirupati.

000

I invite your kind attention to the reference cited I am herewith furnishing the basic value as per M.V. Revision 1-4-2013 for the given locality Gopal Raju colony 19<sup>th</sup> ward nearby door No 19/7/110/A1 as mentioned below.

Sl.No.	Survey No.	Extent of land	Value of land at 19 ward near bydoor No.19/7/110/A1 per sq yards Rs. 30,000/-	Total value
1	190/1A1B2	0.0267 cents		
2.	190/1A1C	0.48		

3.	203/1B	0.11		
4.	203/1C	0.09		
5.	203/2	0.21		
6.	207/1	0.56		
7.	207/2	0.01		
8.	207/3B	0.34		
	Total	1.8267	Or Sqyds.8841.22	Rs.265236600/-

(Rupees Twenty Six crores Fifty two laksh thirty six thousand and six hundred only). Further I submit that this is not for Registration purpose.

Yours faithfully  
Sd/-  
Joint Sub Registrar I  
Tirupati.”

22. The silence of the respondents, in responding to the specific allegations of the petitioners, regarding the change in the land values, in the Basic Value Register, read with the aforesaid correspondence, requires this Court to accept the contentions of the petitioners, that the market value of the lands in question was fixed at Rs.30,000/- in the Basic Value Register.

23. In this backdrop, this Court would have to consider the contentions of the petitioners that they had signed the consent forms with the understanding that they were consenting to payment of compensation by taking the market value at Rs.30,000/- per square yard and the consent was not for accepting a lump sum compensation of Rs.30,000/- per square yard.

24. Another aspect which would have a bearing on this issue has to be noticed. The same land was sought to be acquired under a preliminary notification, No.73 of 2013, dated 04.11.2013. The petitioner, in

W.P.No.34043 of 2017, had filed W.P.No.35639 of 2013 challenging the said preliminary notification. Thereafter, the present notification was issued on 20.07.2015. It is the averment of the Petitioner, that upon publication of this notification, the petitioner in W.P.No.34043 of 2017 had filed objections, on 14.09.2015, raising the issue of reduction of value under the Basic Value Register and that such reduction had been made only to defeat the legitimate right of the petitioners to receive fair compensation. This contention has not been denied by the respondents. In such circumstances, it would be highly doubtful that a person who has been constantly litigating, to protect his property, would accept a reduced rate, especially after he had raised the very same issue before the authorities, by way of his objections.

25. In such circumstances, this Court believes that the consent given by the petitioners in W.P.No.34043 of 2017 as well as the consent given by the petitioner in W.P.No.36069 of 2017 cannot be treated as informed consents accepting the total compensation of Rs.30,000/- per square yard. Another aspect to the matter is the fact that the allegation of the petitioners that he had not received a copy of the award has not been disputed by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent, in the counter affidavit filed by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent. In the absence of such an award, it would also not be possible for the petitioners to seek enhancement of compensation.

26. For all the aforesaid reasons, these Writ Petitions are allowed setting aside the award passed by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent on 01.12.2015, to the extent of the lands of the petitioners herein, with a further direction to the

Respondents to complete the process of passing a fresh award, in relation to the land of the petitioners, in accordance with law, and without reference to the consent forms said to have been signed by the petitioners. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

---

**R. RAGHUNANDAN RAO, J**

Date:-08.04.2026

BSM

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO**

**WRIT PETITION Nos.36069, 33944 & 34043 /2017**

Date:- 08.04.2026

BSM