

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH: AMARAVATI**

\*\*\*\*

**WRIT PETITION No.339 of 2024**

Y.Nagasubbamma, W/o late Palireddy, aged about 52 years, Agriculture, R/o Ashutagaripalli, C.K.Dinne Manadal, YSR District.

... Petitioner.

**Versus**

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep by its Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi, Amaravati, Guntur District and four others.

... Respondents.

DATE OF ORDER PRONOUNCED : **16.04.2024**

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

**HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI**

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the order? : Yes/No
2. Whether the copy of order may be marked to Law Reporters/Journals? : Yes/No
3. Whether His Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the order? : Yes/No

---

**SUBBA REDDY SATTI, J**

**\* HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI**  
**+ WRIT PETITION No.339 of 2024**

**% 16.04.2024**

**WRIT PETITION No.339 of 2024**

Y.Nagasubbamma, W/o late Palireddy, aged about 52 years, Agriculture, R/o Ashutagaripalli, C.K.Dinne Manadal, YSR District.

... Petitioner.

**Versus**

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep by its Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi, Amaravati, Guntur District and four others.

... Respondents.

**! Counsel for Petitioner** : Sri V.R.Reddy Kovvuri

**^ Counsel for Respondents** : GP for Revenue

**< Gist:**

**> Head Note:**

**? Cases referred:**

- 1) 2016 (2) ALD 236 = 2015 SCC OnLine Hyd 407
- 2) AIR 1968 SC 1196
- 3) (2019) 13 SCC 42 : 2019 SCC OnLine SC 398

**This Court made the following:**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH: AMARAVATI**

**HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI**

**WRIT PETITION No.339 of 2024**

Y.Nagasubbamma, W/o late Palireddy, aged about 52 years, Agriculture, R/o Ashutagaripalli, C.K.Dinne Manadal, YSR District.

... Petitioner.

**Versus**

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep by its Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi, Amaravati, Guntur District and four others.

... Respondents.

Counsel for the petitioner : Sri Abhay representing  
Sri V.R.Reddy Kovvuri

Counsel for respondents : GP for Revenue

**ORDER**

The Writ Petition is filed to declare the action of 1<sup>st</sup> respondent in including the land in an extent of Ac.2.48 cents in S.No.1540 of Chintakommadinne Village and Mandal, Kadapa District, in prohibited property list of G.O.Ms.No.152 dated 27.03.2023 under Section 22-A(1)(a) as assigned land and consequential action of 5<sup>th</sup> respondent in refusing to register the document vide P.No.305 of 2023 dated 17.10.2023, as illegal and arbitrary.

2. a) Averments in the affidavit, in brief, are that petitioner is the absolute owner of land of an extent of Ac.2.48 cents in S.No.1540 of C.K.Dinne village fields, C.K. Dinne Mandal, YSR District. The petitioner inherited the property from her father-in-law Yeturi Chinna Kondaiah, who, inturn, purchased the same under registered sale deed dated 23.03.1967. Records of Rights were updated and the name of petitioner was mutated in 1-B and Adangal and pattadar pass book was also issued.

b) During the year 2012, petitioner intended to sell the subject land and approached the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent to furnish market value particulars. The 5<sup>th</sup> Respondent refused to furnish the information stating that as per the list communicated by the Tahsildar, C.K. Dinne Mandal, the subject land is classified as assigned land and hence, it cannot be registered. Petitioner filed W.P.No.32175 of 2012 and the same was allowed on 31.10.2012. However, the transaction was not fructified.

c) Petitioner intended to execute Gift/Settlement deed dated 22.9.2023 in favour of son and presented the document for registration. The 5<sup>th</sup> Respondent refused to register the document stating that property is included in prohibited list as Assigned land under Section 22-A(1)(a) *vide* G.O.Ms.No.152 REVN.

REVSWLAODTL/2/2023-JA(SWLA)-KDPCO. The 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent issued G.O.Ms.No.200 dated 5.05.2016 by including the property referred to supra under Section 22-A (1)(e) of the Registration Act, 1908 (for short "**the Act**"). Later by issuing G.O.Ms.No.152 dated 27.03.2023 it was changed to Section 22-A (1)(a) of the Act. With the above facts, the present writ petition is filed.

3. a) 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent filed counter affidavit. It was contended, *inter alia*, that the petitioner without alternative availing remedy under Section 22-A(4) of the Act filed the writ petition and hence, the same is not maintainable. An extent of Ac.2.48 cents in S.No.1540 of C.K.Dinne village is classified in the RSR as Dotted (...) land. Mere registration of the document does not confer any title or right over the Government lands. Section 22-A of the Act was inserted in the year 2007. Challenging the same writ petitions were filed. The Full Bench of the composite High Court of Andhra Pradesh in **Vinjamuri Rajagopala Chary Vs. State of A.P.**<sup>1</sup>, held that such insertion of Section 22-A is not unconstitutional and further framed certain guidelines. Pursuant to said directions, the State Government communicated prohibited properties list to the Registration

---

<sup>1</sup> 2016 (2) ALD 236 = 2015 SCC OnLine Hyd 407

authorities. The State Government published list of prohibited properties under Section 22-A (1)(e) of the Act. Pursuant to the order in W.P.No.32175 of 2012, petitioner did not submit any document for registration, till the Government published the land in the prohibited properties list under Section 22-A(1)(e). In view of observation of the Full Bench, if any judgments or observations by the High Court or by any other Officer are inconsistent with the judgment of the Full Bench, the observations made by the Full Bench will prevail and would bind the parties and, therefore, the order in W.P.No.32175 of 2012 dated 31.10.2012 does not bind the parties.

b) The Government of Andhra Pradesh enacted the Andhra Pradesh Dotted Lands (Updation in Re-Settlement Register) Act, 2017 (*for short "Act 2017"*) for updation of Dotted lands as Patta lands in RSR. As per G.O.Ms.No.298, a District Level Committee, consisting of District Collector as the Chairperson, Joint Collector, Sub-Collector of Revenue Divisional Officer as members and the Tahsildar as member-convener was constituted. The District Level Committee shall dispose of claims on merits within six months from the date of filing claim. Petitioner can as well make application through mee-seva/Gram Sachivalayam seeking to delete the property from the prohibitory list.

4. Additional counter affidavit was filed reiterating the averments made in the counter affidavit. In the additional counter affidavit, it was pleaded about initial survey and settlement operations etc.

5. Heard Sri Abhay, learned counsel representing Sri V.R. Reddy Kovvuri, learned counsel for petitioner and Sri Dilip, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue for respondents.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner while reiterating the contentions as per the averments made in the affidavit would submit that petitioner's father-in-law purchased property under a registered document dated 23.03.1967 and in fact, the petitioner's name was updated in revenue records including 1-B and adangal. Pattadar passbook was also issued. He would also submit that earlier petitioner filed W.P.No.32175 of 2012 and the same was allowed. He would submit that the Government issued G.O.Ms.No.200 dated 05.05.2016 including the property under Section 22-A (1)(e) of the Act and later, by issuing G.O.Ms.No.152 dated 27.03.2023, the petitioner's land is shown in Section 22-A (1)(a) of the Act. He would also submit that neither the alleged DKT patta was filed nor the name of assigned was mentioned in the counter affidavit and hence, including the petitioner's property in the prohibitory list under Section

22-A (1)(a) of the Act *vide* G.O.Ms.No.152 dated 27.03.2023 is to be set aside.

7. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue would submit that petitioner got effective alternative remedy under Section 22-A (4) of the Act and without availing the same and hence, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed. He would also submit that pursuant to order in W.P.No.32175 of 2012 the Dotted Act, 2017 was enacted and hence, the order in earlier writ petition is of no consequence. He would also submit that unless and until the entry is deleted from prohibitory list under Section 22-A (1)(a), the document cannot be registered.

8. In view of respective submissions, the point of consideration is:

**Whether *res judicata* will apply to writ petitions? If so, inclusion of property under prohibitory list under Section 22-A (1)(a) *vide* G.O.Ms.No.152 dated 27.03.2023 and G.O.Ms.No.200 dated 05.05.2016, is illegal and arbitrary?**

9. Finality of judgment puts an end to judicial process. The doctrine of *res judicata* is based on three Roman maxims.

(1) “***Nemo debet bis vexari pro una et eadem causa***”  
(no man should be vexed twice for the same cause);

(2) “***Interest reipublicae ut sit finis litium***” (it is in the interest of the State that there should be an end to a litigation); and

(3) “***Re judicata pro veritate occipitur***” (judicial decision must be accepted as correct).

10. In **Virudhunagar Steel Rolling Mills Ltd. Vs. Government of Madras**<sup>2</sup>, the Constitution Bench of the Apex Court held that *res judicata* will apply in writ petitions also. As per Section 11 of Civil Procedure Code, 1908, when the matter has been directly and substantially in issue in a former suit between the same parties, or between parties under whom they or any of them claim, litigating under the same title, the decree in former suit would be *res judicata* between the plaintiff and defendant or between the co-plaintiff and co-defendant.

11. In **P.Bandopadhyya Vs. Union of India**<sup>3</sup>, the Hon'ble Apex Court held thus:

---

<sup>2</sup> AIR 1968 SC 1196

<sup>3</sup> (2019) 13 SCC 42 : 2019 SCC OnLine SC 398

“8.11. The decision in **S.V. Vasaikar v. Union of India** [2003 SCC OnLine Bom 171 : (2003) 2 Mah LJ 691 : (2003) 4 Bom CR 79] was not challenged before the Supreme Court, and has since attained finality. Therefore, the relief sought by the appellants before the High Court was barred by the principle of *res judicata*.

Reference can be made to the decision of the Constitution Bench in **Direct Recruit Class II Engg. Officers' Assn. Vs. State of Maharashtra** [(1990) 2 SCC 715 : 1990 SCC (L&S) 339 : AIR 1990 SC 1607] wherein Sharma, J., on behalf of the five-Judge Bench, held: (SCC pp. 740-41, para 35)

“35. ... It is well established that the principles of *res judicata* are applicable to writ petitions. The relief prayed for on behalf of the petitioner in the present case is the same as he would have, in the event of his success, obtained in the earlier writ petition before the High Court. The petitioner in reply contended that since the special leave petition before this Court was dismissed in limine without giving any reason, the order cannot be relied upon for a plea of *res judicata*. The answer is that it is not the order of this Court dismissing the special leave petition which is being relied upon; the plea of *res judicata* has been pressed on the basis of the High Court's judgment which became final after the dismissal of the special leave petition. In similar situation a Constitution Bench of this Court in *Daryao v. State of U.P.* [*Daryao v. State of U.P.*, (1962) 1 SCR 574 : AIR 1961 SC 1457] held that where the High Court dismisses a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution after hearing the matter on the merits, a subsequent petition in the Supreme Court under Article 32 on the same facts and for the same reliefs filed by the same parties will be barred by the general principle of *res judicata*. The binding character of judgments of courts of competent jurisdiction is in essence a part of the rule of law on which the administration of justice, so much emphasised by the Constitution, is founded and a judgment of the High Court under Article 226 passed after a hearing on the merits must bind the parties till set aside in appeal as provided by the Constitution and cannot be permitted to be circumvented by a petition under Article 32.”

Albeit the decision of the Constitution Bench was in the context of a writ petition filed under Article 32, it would apply with greater force to bar a writ petition filed under Article 226, like the one filed by the present appellants, by the operation of the principle of *res judicata*.”

12. Keeping in view of the ratio laid down in the judgments *supra*, this Court intends to proceed further. Case at hand, petitioner's father-in-law purchased the property under a registered sale deed dated 23.03.1967. Petitioner filed W.P.No.32175 of 2012 to declare the action of 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent therein i.e. Tahsildar in including the land referred to *supra* in the list of Assigned/Government land and the consequential action of the Sub Registrar in not registering the document. The said writ petition was disposed of on 31.10.2012, wherein the instructions of the Government Pleader were recorded as follows:

“When the matter is taken up today, based on the written instructions, dated 17.10.2012 issued in Ref.B/313.2012 by the third respondent, it is submitted by the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue appearing for the respondents that the land in question is treated as a Government land basing on the dots shown in RSR of Cherlopalli Village of C.K.Dinne Mandal”

The following observations were made by the learned single Judge of the composite High Court:

“In that view of the matter, there is no reason to include the land in question in the list of Government/Assigned lands prohibiting registration basing on the dots shown in RSR.

For the aforesaid reasons, the writ petition is allowed declaring that inclusion of land admeasuring Acs.2.48 cents

covered by Survey No.1540 situated at C.K.Dinne Village fields, C.K.Dinne Mandal, YSR District, in the list of Government/Assigned lands basing on the dots shown in RSR, is illegal. Consequently, there shall be a direction that in case the petitioner presents any document with regard to transfer of aforesaid land, the fourth respondent shall receive and process the same for registration without treating the said land either as a Government land or an assigned land and without insisting for production of no objection certificate from the revenue authorities. It is made clear that it is open for the registering authority to verify whether such document is in accordance with the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908 and Indian Stamp Act, 1899.”

13. No appeal was filed against the said order and hence, the order in W.P.No.32175 of 2012 became final.

14. In **Vinjamuri Rajagopala Chary's** case, the Full Bench of the composite High Court of Andhra Pradesh framed the points for consideration as follows:

“1. What are the prerequisites that are to be satisfied for applying any one or more of clauses (a) to (e) of Section 22-A(1) of the Registration Act to any document dealing with alienation or transfer by way of sale, agreement of sale, gift, exchange or lease, etc. in respect of immovable property presented for registration?

2. Under what circumstances, the act of the Registering Authority concerned (District Registrar or Sub-Registrar) in refusing from registration of the aforementioned document/s by applying any one or more of the prohibitory clauses (a) to (e) under Section 22-A(1) of the Registration Act can be said to be justified?

In Paragraph-5 of the judgment, it was mentioned as follows:

“5. Before we look at and consider Section 22-A of Registration Act, it would be necessary and relevant to make a brief reference to the six judgments of different learned Judges dealing with Section 22-A, to which our attention was specifically invited to, so as to understand the exact nature of controversy and factual matrix against which the questions were framed and addressed therein, to enable us to frame and address the questions, covering the field of operation of this provision. The six judgments are in

- (i) **T.Yedukondalu Vs. State of A.P.** (2011 SCC OnLine P 179 : AIR 2011 AP 132).
- (ii) **Dr.Dinakar Mogili Vs. State of A.P.** (2011 SCC OnLine AP 488 : 2011 (6) ALD 502)
- (iii) **Guntur City House Construction Co-operative Society Ltd., Guntur Vs. Tahsildar** ((2012 SCC OnLine AP 20 : 2012 (2) ALD 332).
- (iv) **Raavi Satish Vs. State of A.P.** (2012 SCC OnLine AP 856 : 2013 (1) ALT 774).
- (v) **Vinjamuri Rajagopala Chary Vs. State of A.P.** (2015 SCC OnLine Hyd 407 : 2016 (2) ALD 236)
- (vi) **C.Radhakrishnama Naidu Vs. State of A.P.** (2015 SCC OnLine Hyd 198 : 2015 (4) ALT 1)

15. After considering each of the clauses of Section 22-A (1) (a) to (e) of the Act and the Government instructions regarding communication and notification, the reference ordered as follows:

“36. We, thus, summarize our conclusions and issue directions as follows : -

- (i) The authorities mentioned in the guidelines, which are obliged to prepare lists of properties covered by clauses (a) to (d), to be sent to the registering authorities under the provisions of Registration Act, shall clearly indicate the relevant clause under which each property is classified.
- (ii) Insofar as clause (a) is concerned, the concerned District Collectors shall also indicate the statute under which a transaction and its registration is prohibited. Further in respect of the properties covered under clause (b), they shall clearly indicate which of the Governments own the property.
- (iii) Insofar as paragraphs (3) and (4) in the Guidelines, covering properties under clause (c) and (d) are concerned, the authorities contemplated therein shall also forward to the registering authorities, along with lists, the extracts of registers/gazette if the property is covered by either endowment or wakf, and declarations/orders made under the provisions of Ceiling Acts if the property is covered under clause (d).
- (iv) The authorities forwarding the lists of properties/lands to the registering authority shall also upload the same to the website of both the Governments, namely [igrs.ap.gov.in](http://igrs.ap.gov.in) of the State of Andhra Pradesh and [registration.telangana.gov.in](http://registration.telangana.gov.in) of the State of Telangana. If there is any change in the website, the State Governments shall indicate the same to all concerned, may be by issuing a press note or an advertisement in prominent daily news papers.
- (v) No notification, contemplated by sub-section (2) of Section 22A, is necessary with respect to the properties falling under clauses (a) to (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 22-A.
- (vi) The properties covered under clause (e) of Section 22-A shall be notified in the official gazette of the State Governments and shall be forwarded, along with the list of properties, and a copy of the

relevant notification/gazette, to the concerned registering authorities under the provisions of Registration Act and shall also place the said notification/gazette on the aforementioned websites of both the State Governments. The Registering authorities shall make available a copy of the Notification/Gazette on an application made by an aggrieved party.

- (vii) The registering authorities would be justified in refusing registration of documents in respect of the properties covered by clauses (a) to (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 22-A provided the authorities contemplated under the guidelines, as aforementioned, have communicated the lists of properties prohibited under these clauses.
- (viii) The concerned authorities, which are obliged to furnish the lists of properties covered by clauses (a) to (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 22-A, and the concerned Registering Officers shall follow the guidelines scrupulously.
- (ix) It is open to the parties to a document, if the relevant property/land finds place in the list of properties covered by clauses (a) to (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 22-A, to apply for its deletion from the list or modification thereof, to the concerned authorities as provided for in the guidelines. The concerned authorities are obliged to consider the request in proper perspective and pass appropriate order within six weeks from the date of receipt of the application and make its copy available to the concerned party.
- (x) The redressal mechanism under Section 22-A(4) shall be before the Committees to be constituted by respective State Governments as directed in paragraph-35.1 above. The State Governments shall constitute such committees within eight weeks from the date of pronouncement of this judgment.
- (xi) Apart from the redressal mechanism, it is also open to an aggrieved person to approach appropriate forum including Civil Court for either seeking appropriate declaration or deletion of his property/land from the list of prohibited properties or for any other appropriate relief.

- (xii) The directions issued by learned single Judges in **six judgments referred to above or any other judgments dealing with the provisions of Section 22-A, if are inconsistent with the observations made or directions issued in this judgment**, it is made clear that the observations made and directions issued in this judgment shall prevail and would be binding on the parties including the registering authorities under the Registration Act or Government officials or the officials under the Endowments Act, Wakf Act and Ceiling Acts. (emphasis is mine)
- (xiii) If the party concerned seeks extracts of the list/register/gazette of properties covered by clauses (a) to (e) of Section 22-A (1), received by the registering officer on the basis of which he refused registration, it shall be furnished within 10 days from the date of an application made by the aggrieved party.
- (xiv) Registering officer shall not act and refuse registration of a document in respect of any property furnished to him directly by any authority/officer other than the officers/authorities mentioned in the Guidelines.
- (xv) Mere registration of a document shall not confer title on the vendee/alienee, if the property is otherwise covered by clauses (a) to (e), but did not find place in the lists furnished by the concerned authorities to the registering officers. In such cases, the only remedy available to the authorities under clauses (a) to (e) of sub-section (1) of Section 22-A is to approach appropriate forums for appropriate relief.

16. The Direction No.12 of the Full Bench judgment would indicate that the directions issued by learned single Judges in six judgments referred in the judgment or any other judgments dealing with the provisions of Section 22-A, if it is inconsistent with the observations made or directions issued, it is made clear that the observations made and directions issued the judgment (full bench)

shall prevail and would be binding on the parties including the registering authorities under the Registration Act or Government officials or the officials under the Endowments Act, Wakf Act and Ceiling Acts.

17. Earlier litigation in W.P.No.32175 of 2012 between the petitioner on one side and the Government on the other, learned single of composite high court directed the authorities to register the document and made certain observations. Learned counsel appearing for respondent could not point out inconsistency in the order passed by learned single Judge and order in **Vinjamuri Rajagopalachari's** case. In fact, this Court also does not find any inconsistency or conflict.

18. The contention of learned Assistant Government Pleader that by virtue of order in **Vinjamuri Rajagopala Chary's** case, once again the property is included in prohibitory list, is meritless and such a contention cannot be countenanced. Once the order is passed and it becomes final, the order binds both the parties to the litigation. Neither of the parties to the litigation would be allowed to plead changes in law at a later point in time. The order passed binds both the parties and it is set aside. If the legislature enacts any new statute, the situation is something different. The very object of the

*res judicata* that no man should be vexed twice on/for the same cause shall not be allowed to frustrate.

19. Apart from that the property referred to *supra* is included initially in the prohibitory list under Section 22-A (1)(e) *vide* G.O.Ms.No.200 dated 05.05.2016 stating that “violation of assignment conditions”. Later, the entry was changed to Section 22-A(1)(a) *vide* G.O.Ms.No.152 dated 27.03.2023 stating that “violated assignment conditions”. It is pertinent to mention here that the counter affidavit is conspicuously silent as to who is the assignee and on whose favour assignment was made and the date of assignment and its violation. The authority having pleaded assignment ought to have placed relevant material before the Court. However, nothing was placed. Unless the respondent authorities plead assignment in favour of third party and violation of said assignment, they are not expected to keep the property under the prohibitory list. In fact, the original plea of the authorities is that property referred to *supra* is Dotted land and later, the stand was changed to assignment. Thus, the authorities themselves are not clear as to the nature of property.

20. It is very unfortunate that after the judgment in **Vinjamuri Rajagopalachari’s** case, notwithstanding the earlier order, which

became final, the revenue authorities included vast extents of property under Section 22-A (1)(a) to (d) without having supporting documents. Indeed, the case at hand is a classic example. According to counter affidavit, as per RSR, the property is shown as dotted. If the property is shown as dotted, as per the full bench judgment, a notification should be made under Section 22-A (1)(e) of the Act. In G.O.Ms.No.200, the property was included, and it was mentioned as a violation of assignment. Again, the classification was changed to Section 22-A(1)(a) vide G.O.Ms.No.152, impugned in the writ petition. However, nothing is forthcoming as to who is the alleged assignee, date of assignment and violation of the said assignment. The authorities, in the considered opinion of this Court, failed to understand the ratio in **Vinjamuri Rajagopalachari's** case and as a result unsettled the earlier orders passed by the Court.

21. Once, the order in W.P.No.32175 of 2012 became final, inclusion of property in the notification published in Section 22-A (1)(e) vide G.O.Ms.No.200 dated 05.05.2016 and thereafter in Section 22-A (1)(a) vide G.O.Ms.No.152 dated 27.03.2023, in the opinion of this Court, is hit by *res judicata*. If the authorities keep on including the properties in the prohibitory list under Section 22-A (1)(a) to (e), even though the earlier order became final, it will lead

to an incongruous situation. Even without filing appeals, the authorities, in a way, are nullifying the orders passed by the Courts earlier to **Vinjamuri Rajagopalachari's** case without even filing appeals. Such a course in the opinion of this Court is impermissible.

22. In view of discussion *supra*, inclusion of land in an extent of Ac.2.48 cents in S.No.1540 of Chintakommadinne Village and Mandal, Kadapa District, in prohibited property list of G.O.Ms.No.152 dated 27.03.2023 under Section 22-A (1)(a) as assigned land, is hereby set aside. The 5<sup>th</sup> respondent-Sub Registrar shall entertain registration in respect of document bearing P.No.305 of 2013 dated 17.10.2023, if it is in accordance with the provisions of the Registration Act, 1908 and the Indian Stamp Act, 1899.

23. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is **Allowed**. No costs.

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

---

**JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI**

16<sup>th</sup> April, 2024

**Note: LR COPY TO BE MARKED**

B/O  
PVD