



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

[3331]

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

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 3238/2026

Between:

Duwuru Vijay Bhaskar Reddy,

...PETITIONER

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. BUGULU SREETEJA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

2. MALLIKHARJUNA MOORTHY K (SC FOR A.P HOUSING
CORPORATION LIMITED)

3. GP FOR HOUSING

The Court made the following order:

Impugning the show-cause notice *vide* Roc.No.K1/700/2025, dated 16.09.2025 (Ex.P1), issued by respondent No.4, the above writ petition was filed.

Smt. B. Sreeteja, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that as per Circular No.1086689/CPR&RD/EGS/PM-SP/2020, dated 21.02.2023, issued by the Commissioner of Panchayat Raj and Rural Development, respondent No.4 has no jurisdiction to issue the show-cause notice impugned. Learned counsel would also submit that the petitioner, earlier filed W.P.No.1578 of 2025 and the same was disposed of on 18.08.2025. Thereafter, respondent No.4 issued the show-cause notice impugned, for

which, the petitioner submitted an explanation *vide* Ex.P2. Later, the petitioner attended before the authority and submitted another explanation *vide* Ex.P4.

The writ petition was listed on 05.02.2026 and 12.02.2026 and was adjourned at the request of learned Assistant Government Pleader, for getting instructions.

Today, when the matter is taken up, learned Assistant Government Pleader submitted the instructions of the Project Director *vide* Lr.Rc.No.K1/075/2026, dated 13.02.2026. As seen from the instructions, 2nd QC team visited the work site on 04.11.2025 and submitted a report dated 22.11.2025 duly recommending that the total value of the work done by the petitioner is Rs.17,09,952/-; the amount already paid is Rs.8,44,034/- and the balance payment made to the executing agency is Rs.8,65,918/-.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the work entrusted to the petitioner is leveling and filling of housing colonies. In fact, after leveling and filling, the houses were constructed and those were allotted to the beneficiaries.

When this posed a question as to the time fixed to conduct Quality Control, learned Assistant Government Pleader seeks further time.

Given the facts and circumstances of the case, the learned respondent No.4 is requested to appear before this Court in person to assist the Court regarding the work executed by the petitioner; similar works being executed by other contractors; role of Project Director, DWMA; circular issued by the Commissioner of Panchayat Raj and Rural Development dated 21.02.2023 and the time fixed to conduct Quality Control. Learned respondent No.4 shall also produce the entire record relating to these constructions.

List the matter on 23.02.2026 in the Adjourned Motion List.

SUBBA REDDY SATTI, J