



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

[3331]

**TUESDAY, THE TENTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 966/2026

Between:

Kantareddy Jamal Reddy,

...PETITIONER

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. THATHIREDDY ASHOK SRIVASTAVA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

2. GP FOR REVENUE

3. Mattegunta. Sudhir, Standing Counsel For Z.P.Ps, M.P.Ps, Gram
Panchayats

The Court made the following order:

The above writ petition was filed to declare the inaction of the 5th respondent in granting building permission to the petitioner for re-construction of the dwelling house in an extent of 195.5 sq. yards in Sy.No.408 of Seetharamapuram Village, Mahanandi Mandal, Nandyal District, despite payment of requisite fee and submission of necessary documents, as illegal and arbitrary.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that a show-cause notice dated 09.12.2025 (Ex.P2) was issued by the Panchayat Secretary of 5th respondent. The petitioner submitted a reply dated 11.12.2025 (Ex.P3). Thereafter, the petitioner made representations *vide* Exs.P4 and P5. The petitioner paid the building approval fee on 13.12.2025 (Ex.P6).

The writ petition was listed on 03.03.2026. Sri Hruthik, learned counsel representing Sri M.Sudhir, learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondents 4 and 5 submitted that the application made by the petitioner, for grant of building permission, was rejected. Learned counsel seeks time to produce the same.

Today, when the matter taken up, Ms.Kavitha, learned counsel representing Sri M.Sudhir, learned Standing Counsel submitted the copy of proceedings communicated by the Panchayat Secretary of 5th respondent to the petitioner.

A perusal of the proceedings would indicate that as per the letter received from the Sarpanch and the resolution passed in the Gram Panchayat General Body Meeting, the village administration has formal objections regarding the building permission in the specified survey number. The petitioner did not submit any building plan to Panchayat Department. Without a plan, the Panchayat Secretary has no right to give permission for construction of ground floor in Sy.No.408(P). Though the petitioner sent one copy through the registered post showing the proposed construction plan; however, the petitioner failed to submit proper plan, documents or proof to the department to consider his request.

Earlier, the District Gram Panchayat Officer, submitted instructions. As seen from the instructions, the Panchayat Secretary informed the District Gram Panchayat Officer that the petitioner submitted some relevant documents like registration papers, fee receipt paid to Kurnool Urban Development Authority; however, not submitted the building plan. The

aforementioned documents were submitted to the Gram Panchayat, when the house is under construction. The instructions further disclose that necessary instructions will be issued by the Panchayat Secretary to grant building plan approval to the petitioner after verifying the building plan, setbacks etc., as per the Andhra Pradesh Panchayat Raj Act.

Given the facts and circumstances of the case and different instructions, as noted supra, respondent No.3 shall look into the issue and submit a report to this Court, by the next date of hearing.

List the matter on 24.03.2026.

SUBBA REDDY SATTI, J
JLV