



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

[3332]

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY NINTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

WRIT PETITION NO: 7195/2026

Between:

1. R RAMASUBBAIAH, S/O R.SUBBARAYUDU AGE 38 YEARS,
OCCF.P. SHOP DEALER FOR SHOP NO.1338017, BATTALUR
VILLAGE ALLAGADDA MANDAL, NANDYAL DIST.-518543

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPLE SECRETARY CIVIL
SUPPLIES DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI,
GUNTUR DIST.522237

2. THE COLLECTOR CS, NANDYAL DIST., AT NANDYAL.-518502

3. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, NANDYAL DIVISION,
NANDYAL DIST.-518502

4. THE TAHSILDAR, ALLAGADDA MANDAL, NANDYAL DIST.-
518543

5. SMT O V V LAKSHMAMMA, W/O PULLAIAH AGE 52 YEARS, R/O
H.NO.4-76, BATTULURU VILLAGE ALLAGADD MANDAL,
NANDYAL DIST-51854

...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 issue Writ Order or Orders or a Direction more

particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the impugned order issued by the respondent vide RC.B3/CS.66/2026 dt24-I-2026 suspending the petitioner's authorization and entrusting the distribution work to the 5th respondent in respect of FP Shop No.1338017, Battalur Village, Allagadda Mandal, Nandyal Dist., without assigning any valid reasons and without following Publicthe procedure as contemplated under AP State Targeted Distribution System (Control) Order, 2018 is illegal, arbitrary malafide and contrary to provisions of Andhra Pradesh State Targetted Public Distribution System (Control) Order, 2018 and contrary to law laid down by the Honble Apex Court in Kranti Associates Pvt Ltd., ((2010) 9 SCC 496) and also this Honble Court in W.P.NO.17517/20219 apart from violation of the principles of natural justice and consequentiallyset aside the impugned order dt24-I-2026 by directing the Respondents to continue petitioner as FP Shop dealer as usual, and 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 Suspend the impugned order passed by the 3rdrespondent vide Rc.B3/Cs.66/2026 dt:24-I-2026 in respect of FP Shop No.1338017, Battalur Village, Allagadda Mandal, Nandyal Dist., by continuing the petitioner as dealer as usual, pending disposal of the writ petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.M M M SRINIVASA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.NIMMALA SATYANARAYANA

2.GP FOR CIVIL SUPPLIES

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

Questioning the proceedings dated 24.01.2026 issued by the 3rd respondent *vide* Rc.B3/CS.66/2026 suspending the petitioner's authorization in respect of Fair Price Shop No.1338017, Battalur Village, Allagadda Mandal, Nandyal District, the present writ petition is filed.

2. Heard Sri Shaik Rafi, learned counsel representing Sri M.M.M.Srinivasa Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Appasani Vineeth, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Civil Supplies.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner while reiterating the contents of the writ affidavit would contend that the authorities, alleging certain irregularities committed by the petitioner, issued show cause notice framing two charges, for which the petitioner submitted explanation, however, the authorities, without considering the explanation, in a mechanical way, suspended the authorization of the petitioner without giving reasons in violation of the orders passed by this Court in ***K.Prabhavathi vs. State of A.P.*¹**, therefore, the impugned suspension order is liable to be set aside. Accordingly, prayed to allow the writ petition.

4. Sri Appasani Vineeth, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Civil Supplies, while justifying the impugned orders passed by the 3rd respondent contended that there is neither illegality nor procedural

¹ 2020(6) ALD 209

irregularity while passing the orders impugned. He would further contend that the writ petition being meritless deserves dismissal. Accordingly, prayed to dismiss the writ petition.

5. Perused the material available on record and considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties.

6. The petitioner's Fair Price shop dealership authorization was suspended pending enquiry. This Court *vide* orders dated 17.03.2026, granted interim orders, pursuant to the same the petitioner is continuing as Fair Price Shop Dealer.

7. Clause 8(4)(2) of the Andhra Pradesh Targeted Public Distribution System (Control) Order, 2018, mandates that the appointing authority shall dispose the disciplinary case filed against the fair price shop dealers as early as possible, preferably within a period of three (03) months from the date of filing, keeping in view of the convenience of the cardholders and for smooth functioning of Targeted Public Distribution System.

8. It is fairly conceded by the learned Assistant Government Pleader that enquiry had not been completed so far.

9. In view of the above, without going into the merits of the matter, this Court is inclined to dispose of the writ petition by passing the following order:

“The authorities shall conclude the enquiry at the earliest. Till conclusion of enquiry, the interim orders passed by this Court on 17.03.2026 shall continue.”

10. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is ***disposed of***. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

Date: 29th April, 2026

RKS