

APHC010009842026



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

[3328]

MONDAY, THE NINTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA
PRASAD**

WRIT PETITION NO: 1219/2026

Between:

1. YARLAGADDA MADHAVI, W/O. ARUN CHANDRA, AGED 54 YEARS, HINDU, HAVING PERMANENT RESIDENCE AT D.NO.8-44-32, VIDYA NAGAR, NEAR THREE TOWN POLICE STATION, CHINWALT AIR, VISAKHAPATNAM - 530 003 (REPRESENTED THROUGH SRI. ATTALURI PRAVEEN, AGENT DULY APPOINTED VIDE GPA DATED 17.02.2022)

...PETITIONER

AND

1. STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, A.P. SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI ANDHRA PRADESH - 522 238
2. THE GREATER VISAKHAPATNAM MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, REP BY ITS COMMISSIONER, TENNETI BHAVAN, ASILMETTA JUNCTION, VISAKHAPATNAM - 530 003
3. THE CHIEF CITY PLANNER, GREATER VISAKHAPATNAM MUNICIPAL CORPORATION TENNETI BHAVAN, ASILMETTA JUNCTION, VISAKHAPATNAM - 530 003

...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 order or direction, in the nature of writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the 2nd respondent in causing inordinate

delay for grant of TDR in lieu of utilizing the petitioner's land to an extent of 481.84 Sq.yds. or 402.870 Sq.mtrs at Sy.Nos.29/2, 29/4P and 29/5P of Yendada Village, Visakhapatnam Rural Mandal, Visakhapatnam District for laying a 100 feet wide Master Plan Road as being illegal. arbitrary, highhanded, discriminatory and unconstitutional and consequently direct to the 2nd respondent to grant Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) to the petitioner, in accordance with law, particularly in terms of the Rule 168 (2) (a) of the A.P. Building Rules, 2017 as amended vide G.O.Ms.No.223 MA and UD Department dated 09.07.2018, in a time bound manner 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 2nd respondent to take action in furtherance of the representation dated 02.12.2025, as per the timelines prescribed under Memo No.2727066/M2/2025 dated 13.03.2025 pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.MEKA RAHUL CHOWDARY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

The Court made the following:

ORAL ORDER:

The docket would indicate that during the first Hearing itself, this Court directed the learned Counsel for Respondents to obtain Instructions from the Respondents. Again on 02.02.2026 and 04.02.2026 Sri S.Vijay Kumar, learned Counsel, representing Sri A.S.C.Bose, learned Standing Counsel for Respondents, sought time to obtain Instructions. Even after taking time, there is a failure on the part of the Respondent Nos.2 and 3 in rendering Written Instructions to this Court. In this view of the matter, there shall be a Direction to the Respondent Nos.2 and 3 to appear before this Court, online, on 11.02.2026, to answer the queries of this Court.

2. Sri S.Vijay Kumar, learned Counsel, representing Sri A.S.C.Bose, learned Standing Counsel for Respondent Nos.2 and 3, is directed to convey the gist of this Order to the Respondent Nos.2 and 3 forthwith for effective compliance.
3. List the matter on 11.02.2026 in the Motion List.

GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD, J

Dt: 09.02.2026

Note: Issue C.C today,
B/o,
SJ