



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

[3209]

THURSDAY, THE TWELFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

WRIT PETITION NO: 4180/2026

Between:

1. KALLURI JOSHUA,, W/O PANGA SURENDRA REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS, R/O NARSAPURAM,
PRODDATUR MANDAL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT. (SC
NO. 2611121000371)
2. KALLURI SIVA RAMI REDDY,, S/O KALLURI BHASKAR
REDDY, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, R/O KOTHAPALLE,
PRODDATUR MANDAL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT. (SC
NO. 2611121000369)
3. KARNATI MADHU SUDHAN REDDY,, S/O NARAYANA
REDDY, AGED ABOUT 51 YEARS, R/O KETHAVARAM,
CHAPADU (R) MANDAL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT. (SC
NO. 2611121000364) AND (SC NO. 2611121000382)
4. KALLURI BHASKAR REDDY,, S/O KALLURI NARAYANA
REDDY, AGED ABOUT 62 YEARS, R/O PRODDATUR,
PRODDATUR MANDAL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT. (SC
NO. 2611121000380)
5. KALLURI MANUSHA,, D/O KALLURI BHASKAR REDDY,
AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, R/O BHIMAVARAM,
CHAPADU (R) MANDAL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT. (SC

NO. 2611121000376).

- 6.KALLURI PADHMA,, W/O KALLURI BHASKAR REDDY, AGED ABOUT 52 YEARS, R/O PRODDATUR, PRODDATUR (R) MANDAL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT. (SC NO. 2611121000375)
- 7.PALAGIRI MADHAVI LATHA,, W/O PALAGIRI ASHWIN KUMAR REDDY, AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS, R/O PRODDATUR, PRODDATUR (R) MANDAL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT. (SC NO. 2611121000383)
- 8.TALARI SREENU,, S/O T RAMA SUBBAIAH, AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS, R/O KUCHUPAPA VILLAGE, CHAPADU MANDAL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT.(SC NO. 2611121000374)

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

- 1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, ENERGY DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI. PIN 522238.
- 2.SOUTHERN POWER DISTRIBUTION COMPANY OF A P LIMITED APSPDCL, REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER, TIRUPATHI, TIRUPATHI DISTRICT. PIN - 517503.
- 3.THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, OPERATION, APSPDCL, MYDUKUR, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT.PIN - 516172.
- 4.THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, OPERATION SECTION, APSPDCL, CHAPADU, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT. PIN 516360.
- 5.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR CUM CHAIRMAN, DISTRICT LEVEL IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE,(DLIC),

KADAPAYSR KADAPA DISTRICT.PIN -516001.

...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, direction or order, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the notices dated 31.01.2026 issued by the 4th respondent to the petitioners as arbitrary, illegal, unconstitutional, unfair. colourable exercise of power and against the procedure contemplated under the electricity act 2003, Rules and regulations made there under and consequently direct the respondents not to disconnect the service connection nos 1. SC No. 2611121000371, 2. SC No. 2611121000369, 3. SC No. 2611121000364, 4. SC No. 2611121000382, 5. SC No. 2611121000380, 6. SC No. 2611121000376, 7. SC No. 2611121000375, 8. SC No. 2611121000383 and 9. SC No. 2611121000374 Situate in Kuchupapa Village, Chapadu Mandal, YSR Kadapa District in respect of Aqua Farm belonging to the petitioners and 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 respondents not to disconnect the service connection nos 1. SC No. 2611121000371, 2. SC No. 2611121000369, 3. SC No. 2611121000364, 4. SC No. 2611121000382, 5. SC No. 2611121000380, 6. SC No. 2611121000376, 7. SC No. 2611121000375, 8. SC No. 2611121000383 and 9. SC No. 2611121000374 Situate in Kuchupapa Village, Chapadu Mandal, YSR Kadapa District in respect of Aqua Farm belonging to the petitioners, and to pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1.T NAGARJUNA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR ENERGY

The Court made the following:

ORDER

The petitioners, who are having electricity service connections for carrying on their aquaculture activities, filed the present writ petition challenging the individual notices dated 31.01.2026, calling upon them to furnish the following documents i.e., 1. Copy of approval obtained from Aqua culture and Animal (sic. Annual) Husbandry towards fish ponds; and 2. Copy of approval obtained from local Panchayath Officer. The said notices were issued on the premise that a complaint was received about releasing of power supply illegally with wrong category even no power approvals obtained as per rules. The date for submission of the documents were mentioned as per the said notices, the documents were supposed to be submitted on or before 15.02.2026. It is also stated that the documents were not furnished on or before that date, the officer concerned would proceed further as per rules and without any further notice.

2. Sri T.Nagarjuna Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners, while referring to the averments made in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition and the material placed on record i.e., Ex.P2, the license for establishing new freshwater aqua culture farms stated to have been issued to the District Level

Implementation Committee(DLIC). He submits that the petitioners are having the requisite permissions. He submits that though time was granted till 15.02.2026 for submission of the documents, on 10.02.2026, the 4th respondent along with staff and police, personally came to the petitioners' aqua farm and highhandedly tried to disconnect the electricity connection. He further submits such an attempt was made at the behest of local politicians and the said acts are contrary to law. He also submits that the way in which the respondent authorities are acting would clearly indicate that there are some determine to disconnect the power supply to the petitioners' service connection, due to political pressure. He also submits that though reply to the said notice, according to his submissions on 11.02.2026, the petitioners in view of the conduct of the respondent authorities cannot accept any just decision even after the relevant material is submitted to them.

In view of the above stated position, the learned counsel seeks proper directions seeking stay of disconnection to the subject matter service connection.

On the other hand, Mr.K.Ashok, learned counsel representing Mr.Kota Venkata Rama Rao, learned Standing

counsel for APSPDCL submits that the petitioners filed the present writ petition on mere apprehension. He submits that if the petitioners submitted their relevant material as sought for in the notices dated 31.01.2026, the concerned officer i.e., the 4th respondent will pass appropriate orders. **He submits that a complaint was received against the petitioners about utilizing of power supply without proper approvals, as such, the impugned notices were issued and the action of the part of the 4th respondent cannot be found fault with.**

Considering the submissions made and on perusal of the material available on record, it is discernible from the impugned notice dated 31.01.2026, the petitioners were granted 15 days time for submitting the documents mentioned above. It appears that in view of the complaint stated to have been received, surprisingly, to which there is no date, names etc., the information thus sought for. While the said aspect supports the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioners that the authorities coupled with the alleged action trying to disconnect the power supply to the connections on 10.02.2026 even the power expiry on time granted to the petitioners. This court has brought proposal to examine the matter by inviting the counter affidavits.

Suffice to state that, the petitioners have submitted their explanations as by the learned counsel for the petitioners on 11.02.2026.

In view of the same, this deems it appropriate to dispse of the writ petition leaving it open to the 4th respondent to pass appropriate orders. At this juncture, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are intending to submit additional reply/explanation along with certain documents and seeks some time. Considering the said submission, the petitioners are granted three weeks time for submitting additional reply along with the documents, if any.

On receipt of the said additional reply along with the documents, the 4th respondent shall pass appropriate orders strictly in accordance with law within two weeks, thereafter. Till appropriate orders, in accordance with law have passed, no coercive steps of disconnection to the service connections of the petitioners shall be resorted to.

Mr.K.Ashok, learned counsel shall intimate the orders passed by this Court to the concerned officer, so that they will not

take any steps for disconnection of subject matter service connection.

The petitioners, who are having electricity service connections for carrying on their aquaculture activities, filed the present writ petition challenging the individual notices dated 31.01.2026, calling upon them to furnish the following documents: (1) Copy of approval obtained from the Aquaculture Department and Annual (sic. Animal) Husbandry Department towards fish ponds; and (2) Copy of approval obtained from the local Panchayat Officer. The said notices were issued on the premise that a complaint was received alleging release of power supply illegally under a wrong category without obtaining proper power approvals as per rules. As per the said notices, the documents were to be submitted on or before 15.02.2026. It was also stated that if the documents were not furnished within the stipulated time, the officer concerned would proceed further as per rules without any further notice.

2. Sri T. Nagarjuna Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioners, while referring to the averments made in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition and the material placed on record, i.e., Ex.P2 — the licence for establishing fresh aquaculture farms stated to have been issued by the District Level Implementation Committee (DLIC) — submits

that the petitioners are having the requisite permissions. He submits that though time was granted till 15.02.2026 for submission of the documents, on 10.02.2026 the 4th respondent, along with staff and police, personally came to the petitioners' aqua farms and highhandedly attempted to disconnect the electricity connections. He further submits that such an attempt was made at the behest of local politicians and that the said acts are contrary to law. He also submits that the manner in which the respondent authorities are acting clearly indicates a predetermined intention to disconnect the power supply to the petitioners' service connections due to political pressure. He further submits that though a reply to the said notice was submitted on 11.02.2026, in view of the conduct of the respondent authorities, the petitioners apprehend that they may not receive a fair and just decision even after submission of the relevant material.

In view of the above, the learned counsel seeks appropriate directions, including stay of disconnection of the subject service connections.

3. On the other hand, Mr. K. Ashok, learned counsel representing Mr. Kota Venkata Rama Rao, learned Standing Counsel for APSPDCL, submits that the petitioners have filed the present writ petition on mere apprehension. He submits that if the petitioners submit the relevant material as sought in the notices dated 31.01.2026, the concerned officer, i.e., the 4th respondent, will pass appropriate orders. He further submits that a complaint was received against the petitioners alleging utilization of power supply without proper approvals, and therefore, the impugned notices were issued, and the action of the 4th respondent cannot be faulted.
4. Considering the submissions made and upon perusal of the material available on record, it is discernible from the impugned notices dated 31.01.2026 that the petitioners were granted 15 days' time for submission of the documents mentioned therein. It appears that the notices were issued based on a complaint, the details of which, such as date and name of the complainant, are not mentioned. The allegation that an attempt was made to disconnect the power supply on 10.02.2026, even before

expiry of the time granted to the petitioners, supports the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioners. This Court is inclined to examine the matter by calling for counter affidavits. It is stated by the learned counsel for the petitioners that an explanation was submitted on 11.02.2026.

5. In view of the above, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition, leaving it open to the 4th respondent to pass appropriate orders. At this juncture, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners intend to submit an additional reply/explanation along with certain documents and seeks some time for the same. Considering the said submission, the petitioners are granted three (3) weeks' time to submit an additional reply along with relevant documents, if any.

On receipt of the said additional reply along with documents, the 4th respondent shall pass appropriate orders strictly in accordance with law within two (2) weeks thereafter. Till such appropriate orders are passed in accordance with law, no

coercive steps, including disconnection of the petitioners' service connections, shall be taken.

Mr. K. Ashok, learned counsel, shall communicate the orders passed by this Court to the concerned officer to ensure that no steps are taken for disconnection of the subject service connections in the meantime.