



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

**[3504]**

WEDNESDAY, THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF MARCH  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 7604/2026**

**Between:**

1. PULLELA SATYA RAMA LINGA SASTRY,, S/O SUBRAHMANYA SURYANARAYANA, AGE- 45 YEARS, OCC ARCHAKA (PUROHIT), R/O GHANTAVEEDI, MUMMIDIVARAM, DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR KONASEEMA DISTRICT.

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, ENDOWMENTS DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDING, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT - 522238.
2. THE COMMISSIONER, ENDOWMENTS DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT OF A.P., GOLLAPUDI, VIJAYAWADA, ANDHRA PRADESH - 521225.
3. SRI VIGNESWARA SWAMY VANI DEVASTHANAM, AINAVILLI REP BY ITS EXECUTIVE OFFICER, DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR KONASEEMA DISTRICT - 521225.

**...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 a Writ, Order or Direction more particularly in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the respondents in not considering the representation, dated of the petitioner seeking appointment as Hereditary Archaka (Purohith) in Sri Vigneswara Swamy Vari Devasthanam, Ainavilli, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Konaseema District, pursuant to Memo in L.Dis.No.A 1 / 11/1/2024 dated 08.08.2024 issued by the 2nd respondent, as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to consider and pass appropriate orders

on the representation of the petitioner within a reasonable time as deemed fit by this Hon'ble Court

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1.K.V.AKHILESWARA REDDY

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1.GP FOR SERVICES II

**The Court made the following ORDER:**

When the matter was taken up for hearing in the morning session, Sri K.V.Akhilesvara Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner advanced arguments. However, due to the absence of learned Government Pleader for Endowments, the matter was passed over.

2. After the lunch session, Sri G. Nagarjuna Naguru, learned Government Pleader for Endowments, appears and submits that the petitioner is habituated in filing multiple writ petitions without any legal cause. He submits that the petitioner does not come under the purview of hereditary of Archaka in terms of the A.P. Charitable and Hindu Religious Institutions and Endowments Act, 1987 (Act 30 of 1987). He also submits that the petitioner filed four writ petitions with different reliefs, contending that he belongs to the hereditary of Archaka family, but the said fact is not at all true and correct.

3. After hearing the vehement assertions of the learned Government Pleader, learned counsel for the petitioner, seeks permission of this Court to withdraw the writ petition.

4. Permission is accorded and the writ petition is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn. There shall be no order as to costs. As a sequel, all pending applications shall stand closed.

---

**JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM**

Date: 23.03.2026  
GVK

**58**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM**

**WRIT PETITION No.7604 of 2026**

Date: 23.03.2026

GVK