

Date of reserved for orders : 30.07.2026
Date of pronouncement : 08.09.2026
Date of uploading : 08.09.2026

APHC010253722026



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

[3457]

TUESDAY, THE 8th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

**WRIT PETITION NO: 13409, 13413, 13415, 13417, 13420, 13422, 13423,
13426 of 2026**

WP.No.13409 of 2026

Between:

1. MUDDULURU CHANDRA MOHAN RAJU, S/O M. VENKATA SUBBA RAJU, AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS, R/O D.NO. 7-612/4, R.S. ROAD, KODURU, ANNAMAIAH DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 516101.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT. 522237
2. THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF TIRUPATI, REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER, TIRUPATI, ANDHRA PRADESH - 517501.

...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 an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one or more in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in laying the road over an extent of 45.03 Sq. Mts. (53.83 Sq.Yards) in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati without following due process of law and without payment of compensation and compelling the petitioner to give consent to surrender the land at the rate of Rs. 17,000/- persq. yard as fixed by them, as arbitrary, illegal and without jurisdiction and in violation of Article 300 A of the constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents to redeliver the possession of Subject land admeasuring 45.03 Sq. Mts. (53.83 Sq.Yards) in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati or alternatively to initiate land acquisition proceedings and pay proper compensation in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and to pass

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 to direct the Respondent to initiate land acquisition proceedings in respect of land admeasuring 45.03 Sq. Mts. (53.83 Sq.Yards) in Sy. No.

165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. GALLA SUDARSANA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. POTHAM VENGALA REDDY SC For M. Corporation in Rayalaseema region In

2. GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

WP.No.13413 of 2026

Between:

1. S JYOTHEESWARI, W/O A SRINIVASULU AGED ABOUT 56 YEARS
R/O D NO 7-612/2, R. S ROAD, KODURU, ANNAMAIH DISTRICT,
A.P -516 101 **...PETITIONER**

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.

2. THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF TIRUPATI, REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER, TIRUPATI, ANDHRA PRADESH - 517501.

...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 an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one or more in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in laying the road over an extent of 82.32 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati without following due process of law and without payment of compensation and compelling the petitioner to give consent to surrender the land at the rate of Rs.17,000/- per sq. yard as fixed by them, as arbitrary, illegal and without jurisdiction and in violation of Article 300 A of the constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents to redeliver the possession of Subject land admeasuring 82.32 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati or alternatively to initiate land acquisition proceedings and pay proper compensation in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013. and to pass

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 to direct the Respondent to initiate land acquisition proceedings in respect of land admeasuring 82.32 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and

Resettlement Act, 2013 pending the above writ petition pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. GALLA SUDARSANA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. POTHAM VENGALA REDDY SC For M. Corporation in Rayalaseema region In
2. GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

WP.No.13415 of 2026

Between:

1. MUDDULURU BHARATHI, W/O M CHANDRA MOHAN RAJU AGED ABOUT 50 YEARS R/O DNO 7/612/4, R. S. ROAD KODURU, ANNAMAIAH DISTRICT, A. P- 516 101

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT 522238.
2. THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF TIRUPATI, REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER, TIRUPATI, ANDHRA PRADESH - 517501

...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 may be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one or more in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in laying the road over an extent of 88.28 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati without following due process of law and without payment of compensation and compelling the petitioner to give consent to surrender the land at the rate of Rs.17,000/- per sq. yard as fixed by them, as arbitrary, illegal and without jurisdiction and in violation of Article 300 A of the constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents to redeliver the possession of Subject land admeasuring 88.28 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati or alternatively to initiate land acquisition proceedings and pay proper compensation in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and to pass such

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 may be pleased to direct the Respondent to initiate land acquisition proceedings in respect of land admeasuring 88.28 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and

Resettlement Act, 2013 pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. GALLA SUDARSANA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. POTHAM VENGALA REDDY SC For M. Corporation in Rayalaseema region In
2. GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

WP.No.13417 of 2026

Between:

1. ADLURI SAI JISHNU, S/O A SRINIVASULU AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS
R/O D NO 7/612/2, R S ROAD, KODURU ANNAMAIAH DISTRICT A. P
-516 101

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, ARNARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF TIRUPATI, REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER, TIRUPATI, ANDHRA PRADESH -517501.

...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 an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one or more in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in laying the road over an extent of 150.97 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati without following due process of law and without payment of compensation and compelling the petitioner to give consent to surrender the land at the rate of Rs.17,000/- per sq. yard as fixed by them, as arbitrary, illegal and without jurisdiction and in violation of Article 300 A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents to redeliver the possession of Subject land admeasuring 150.97 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati or alternatively to initiate land acquisition proceedings and pay proper compensation in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and to pass

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 to direct the Respondent to initiate land acquisition proceedings in respect of land admeasuring 150.97 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and

Resettlement Act, 2013 pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. GALLA SUDARSANA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. POTHAM VENGALA REDDY SC For M. Corporation in Rayalaseema region In
2. GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

WP.No.13420 of 2026

Between:

1. MUDDULURU CHANDRA MOHAN RAJU, S/O M VENKATA SUBBA RAJU, AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS R/O D NO 7/612/4, R S ROAD, KODURU, ANNAMAIAH DISTRICT, A.P -516 101
2. ADLURI SRINIVASULU, S/O NAGAIAH AGED ABOUT 58 YEARS, R/O D NO 7/612/4, R S ROAD, KODURU, ANNAMAIAH DISTRICT, A. P -516 101

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF TIRUPATI, REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER, TIRUPATI, ANDHRA PRADESH - 517501.

...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 topleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one or more in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the u Respondents in laying the road over an extent of 129.93 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati Without following due process of law and without payment of compensation and compelling the petitioner to give consent to surrender the land at the rate of Rs.17,000/- persq. yard as fixed by them, as arbitrary. illegal and without jurisdiction and in violation of Article 300 A of the constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents to redeliver the possession of Subject land admeasuring 129.93 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati or alternatively to initiate land acquisition proceedings and pay proper compensation in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and to pass

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 to direct the Respondent to initiate land acquisition proceedings in

respect of land admeasuring 129.93 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. GALLA SUDARSANA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. POTHAM VENGALA REDDY SC For M. Corporation in Rayalaseema region In
2. GP FOR MUNICIPAL ADMN URBAN DEV

WP.No.13422/2026

Between:

1. C VASUDHA, W/O S CHENGAL RAJU AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS R/O D NO 20-3-315/J, SIVA JYOTHI NAGAR, TIRUPATI A. P -517501

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF TIRUPATI, REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER, TIRUPATI, ANDHRA PRADESH - 517501.

...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 an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one or more in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in laying the road over an extent 77.12 in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati without following due process of law and without payment of compensation and compelling the petitioner to give consent to surrender the land at the rate of Rs. 17,000/- per sq. yard as fixed by them, as arbitrary illegal and without jurisdiction and in violation of Article 300 A of the constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents to redeliver the possession of Subject land admeasuring 45.03 Sq. Mts. (53.83 Sq.Yards) in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati or alternatively to initiate land acquisition proceedings and pay proper compensation in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and to pass such

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 to direct the Respondent to initiate land acquisition proceedings in respect of land admeasuring 45.03 Sq. Mts. (53.83 Sq.Yards)

in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 ending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. GALLA SUDARSANA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. POTHAM VENGALA REDDY SC For M. Corporation in Rayalaseema region In
2. GP FOR MUNICIPAL ADMN URBAN DEV

WP.No.13423 of 2026

Between:

1. KEERTHIPATI SANKARA RAJU, S/O K RAMARAJU, AGED ABOUT 64 YEARS, R/O FLAT NO 203, KENNADY NAGAR, V N R PLAZA, TIRUPATI, A.P 517 501
2. KEERTHIPATI CHANDRA SHEKHAR RAJU, S/O K RAMARAJU AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS, R/O D/NO 4-10, B. P RACHAPALLI, BOMMAVARAM, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT, A. P 516110

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF TIRUPATI, REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER, TIRUPATI, ANDHRA PRADESH -517501.

...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 may be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one or more in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in laying the road over an extent of 153.21 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati without following due process of law and without payment of compensation and compelling the petitioner to give consent to surrender the land at the rate of Rs.17,000/- per sq. yard as fixed by them, as arbitrary, illegal and without jurisdiction and in violation of Article 300 A of the constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents to redeliver the possession of Subject land admeasuring 153.21 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati or alternatively to initiate land acquisition proceedings and pay proper compensation in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and to pass such

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 may be pleased to direct the Respondent to initiate land acquisition proceedings in respect of land admeasuring 153.21 Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. GALLA SUDARSANA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. POTHAM VENGALA REDDY SC For M. Corporation in Rayalaseema region In
2. GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

WP.No.13426 of 2026**Between:**

1. DASARAJU LEELAVATHI, W/O DASARAJU BHARANI KUMAR AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS R/O D NO 203151W3, SIVA JYOTHI NAGAR 10TH CROSS, TIRUPATI TOWN TIRUPATI DISTRICT A P 517501
2. MUDDLURU BHARATHI, W/O M VENKATESWARULU AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS RIO D NO 20-3-135/J, 2ND FLOOR SIVA JYOTHI NAGAR, 10TH CROSS TIRUPATI TOWN, A. P 517501

...PETITIONER(S)**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. THE MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF TIRUPATI, REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER, TIRUPATI, ANDHRA PRADESH -517501.

...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 topleased to issue an I appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one or more in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in laying the road over an extent of 361.20Sq. Mts. (53.83 Sq.Yards) in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, STirupati without following due process of law and without payment of compensation and compelling the petitioner to give consent to surrender the land at the rate of Rs.17,000/- per sq. yard as fixed by them, as arbitrary, illegal and without jurisdiction and in violation of Article 300 A of the constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents to redeliver the possession of Subject land admeasuring 361.20Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati or alternatively to initiate land acquisition proceedings and

pay proper compensation in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and to pass

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 to direct the Respondent to initiate land acquisition proceedings in respect of land admeasuring 361.20Sq. Mts. in Sy. No. 165/2 of Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati in accordance with Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. GALLA SUDARSANA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. POTHAM VENGALA REDDY SC For M. Corporation in Rayalaseema region In
2. GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N**WRIT PETITION Nos. 13409, 13413, 13415, 13417, 13420, 13422, 13423
and 13426 of 2026****COMMON ORDER:**

1. The batch of writ petitions are filed by the property owners whose property was taken over by the respondent corporation for formation of 100 feet Masterplan road from Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati and seek a declaration of the action of the respondents in laying the road over the petitioners' property and compelling the petitioners to give consent for surrendering their land @ Rs.17,000/- per square yard and a consequential direction to deliver the possession of the petitioners' extent of property or to initiate land acquisition proceedings for payment of proper compensation in accordance with the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.
2. Sri.Ghanta Rama Rao, the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners, submits that the petitioners' property is abutting the road and the said road was proposed to be widened as a 100-feet Masterplan road. All the petitioners executed registered gift deeds in favour of the respondent-corporation, as desired by the respondent-corporation, for the grant of TDR Certificates.
3. It is submitted that though the petitioners executed registered gift deeds and the respondent-corporation had laid the road, the respondent corporation failed to issue the TDR Certificates as promised. Aggrieved

by the inaction on the part of the respondent corporation in issuing the TDR bonds, the petitioners filed a batch of writ petitions which this Court disposed of by recording the contention of the respondent Municipality that the grievances of the petitioner were adequately being addressed by placing the claim of the petitioners before the scrutiny committee. Recording the submissions, the learned single Judge of this Court disposed of the batch of writ petitions, directing the 2nd respondent to place the file of the petitioner(s) before the scrutiny committee and also directed the respondents to consider for issuance of TDR bonds within a period of two months.

4. It is submitted that the respondent authorities did not comply with the orders of this Court and, as such, contempt cases were filed. After filing of the contempt cases, the 2nd respondent issued the impugned proceedings. As the 2nd respondent passed speaking orders, this Court closed the contempt cases.
5. It is submitted that the 2nd respondent has issued the impugned proceedings by stating that the scrutiny committee has approved the claim of the petitioners and the 2nd respondent had unilaterally fixed the market value with effect from 01.06.2023 @ Rs.17,000/- per square yard and thus inform the petitioners that the petitioners are entitled for TDR bonds for the extent of land surrendered by calculating the value @ Rs.17,000/- per square yard.

6. The learned senior counsel further submits that the 2nd respondent ought to have initiated appropriate proceedings for acquisition of the petitioners' properties; however, it had, in a highhanded manner, taken over the petitioners' properties for the purpose of laying a road by promising to issue TDR bonds. It is submitted that the square-yard rate as on the date of execution of the registered gift deeds by the petitioners was Rs. 37,000/- per square yard. It is submitted that the registered gift deed would also refer to the value of the property at Rs.37,000/- per square yard.
7. It is submitted that the petitioners are entitled to TDR bonds @ Rs.37,000/- per square yard and not at Rs.17,000/- per square yard as unilaterally determined by the 2nd respondent. It is submitted that the market value certificate issued by the competent Sub-Registrar for the petitioners' property as on 06.07.2023 is for Rs. 37,000/- per square yard. The market value of the property as on 17.10.2025 is shown as Rs. 17,000/- per square yard, and as on 19.01.2026, it is shown as Rs. 45,000/- per square yard. The learned senior counsel submits that the market value certificates issued by the competent authority are filed along with a memo dated 07.05.2026.
8. The learned standing counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent filed a counter. It is stated that the scrutiny committee had determined the entitlement of the petitioners for TDR rights at Rs.17,000/- per square yard and, as such, the petitioners were called upon to execute and

submit a revised/rectified gift settlement deed (s) duly reflecting the market value as Rs.17,000/- per square yard.

9. It is submitted that the claim of the petitioners was placed before the scrutiny committee as directed by this Court, and the scrutiny committee had determined the applicable market value for issuance of TDR bonds by considering Rs.17,000/- as market value per square yard.
10. It is also submitted that the petitioners, while executing the registered gift deed, mentioned the nearest door number to their property, which was classified as a commercial property. By mentioning the nearest door numbers, the petitioners' residential property cannot be considered a commercial property for the issuance of TDR bonds at Rs. 37,000/- per square yard. It is stated that the petitioners have mentioned the value of the property at Rs. 37,000/- per square yard in the registered gift deeds, with reference to commercial properties. It is also submitted that, as on date, the prevailing market value of a commercial property is Rs.45,000/- per square yard, and the value of a residential property in the said area is about Rs.17,000/- per square yard.
11. It is submitted that the petitioners are not entitled to the grant of TDR bonds at Rs.37,000/- per square yard. The 2nd respondent has filed a common counter stating that the value of the subject property would have to be dealt as a residential property only and that the value of a residential property in the said area is about Rs.21,000/- per square yard as for the year 2025 and it is value at Rs.17,000/- for the year 2023

and commercial value per square yard for the year 2023 is Rs.37,000/- per square yard and the same is Rs.45,000/- for the year 2025.

12. In reply, the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the counter filed by the respondents refers to the Google pictures of the subject property and the petitioners' property is shown as vacant land abutting the main road. The door number mentioned by the petitioners is that of a property located away from the petitioners' property. It is submitted that the Sub-Registrar could not have classified any property for valuation as residential or commercial, and that the correspondence dated 20.07.2026 was addressed by the Joint Sub-Registrar – 1, Tirupati to the Commissioner of Tirupati Municipal Corporation. It is submitted that the respondents cannot deny the petitioners their entitlement to TDR bonds at Rs. 37,000/- per square yard.

13. Heard the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned standing counsel for the respondent No.2. Perused the material on record.

14. The petitioners have surrendered their lands for laying of road. The petitioners have also executed registered gift deeds as desired by the respondent corporation to facilitate the laying of the 100-foot Masterplan road. The respondent corporation could not have taken over the petitioners' properties without paying any compensation and without resorting to acquisition proceedings. This Court has considered several

writ petitions where the property owners holding small extents of land were either convinced or coerced into surrendering their properties for public purposes. This Court has come to the rescue of such property owners and directed payment of compensation for the land acquired, or considered the property owners' claims and directed issuance of TDR Certificates.

- 15.** On the facts of this case, the petitioners have surrendered their lands, executed registered gift deeds, the respondent-corporation had laid the road and denied issuing TDR bonds to the petitioners.
- 16.** The record also reveals that the petitioners have filed writ petitions seeking direction from this Court to the respondent authorities to issue TDR bonds. It is also evident that the respondent-corporation had submitted before this Court that the petitioners' claim was placed before the scrutiny committee for consideration of the issuance of TDR bonds, and the writ petitions were closed with the observation that the scrutiny committee's examination of the petitioners' claim shall be undertaken. Accordingly, the respondents are required to consider issuance of TDR bonds.
- 17.** The 2nd respondent has issued the impugned proceedings by determining the market value at Rs.17,000/- per square yard and further stating that the claim of the petitioners for issuance of TDR certificates was approved; however, the market value for the petitioners' property was fixed at Rs.17,000/- per square yard.

- 18.** Admittedly, the Google map filed by the 2nd respondent along with the counter amply clears the ambiguity about the location of the petitioners' properties. The petitioners' properties are evidently abutting the main road. The door number specified by the petitioners in the registered gift deeds refers to a property situated away from the main road. The market value certificates issued by the competent Sub-Registrar dated 06.07.2023 at Rs.37,000/- per square yard, 17.10.2025 at Rs.17,000/- per square yard, and 19.01.2026 at Rs.45,000/- per square yard do not refer to the classification of the properties as residential, commercial, semi-residential, or semi-commercial.
- 19.** When the properties of the petitioners are abutting the main road, they could be put to either commercial, residential, semi-commercial or semi-residential use. The property as on the date of execution of the registered gift deeds by the petitioners was a vacant site. It could have been put to residential or commercial use subject to obtaining necessary approvals from the 2nd respondent. The classification of the petitioners' property as residential and the unilateral determination of the market value at Rs. 17,000/- per square yard do not withstand the scrutiny of law and logic. As on the date of execution of the registered gift deed the value of the property was determined and considered as Rs.37,000/- per square yard. As such, the petitioners are entitled to issuance of TDR bonds at Rs.37,000/- per square yard and the

impugned proceedings are hereby modified to the extent of entitling the petitioners to grant of TDR bonds at Rs.37,000/- per square yard.

- 20.** Accordingly, the writ petitions are disposed of, directing the 2nd respondent to issue the TDR bonds to the petitioners for the extent of their properties which were taken over by the 2nd respondent for laying of 100 feet Masterplan road from Konkachennaigunta Village, Tirupati. The respondents shall have to issue TDR bonds as directed by this Court within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE HARINATH.N

Dated 08.09.2026
KGM

Whether the order is:

Speaking		Reasoned	☒
Reportable		Non-reportable	☒

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

WRIT PETITION Nos. 13409, 13413, 13415, 13417, 13420, 13422, 13423
and 13426 of 2026
Dated 08.09.2026

KGM