



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

[3331]

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 7269/2025

Between:

G Dasaradha Ramaaiah

...PETITIONER

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. UMESH CHANDRA P V G

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. SANISETTY VENKATESWARLU SC For APSRTC

2. GP FOR TRANSPORT

The Court made the following order:

Notice before admission.

Sri S. Venkateswarlu, learned Standing Counsel takes notice on behalf of respondents 2 to 4, offers to file Vakalat and seeks time to file counter affidavit.

The above writ petition is filed challenging the tender notification No.P7/707(01)/2025-DPTO/NTR, dated 13.03.2025 (Ex.P1), in relation to Stall No.DB-01, without considering the representation made by the petitioner dated 04.02.2025, seeking extension of license period, as illegal and arbitrary.

Heard learned counsel appearing on either side.

A Deed of License was entered into between the petitioner and APSTRC represented by its Managing Director on 18.04.2009, in respect of Stall No.DA-4, Space measuring 31700 square feet, beside Kalimatha Temple at Departure Block of Pandit Nehru Bus Station, Vijayawada, for a period of 10 years i.e. from 23.01.2009 to 22.01.2019. Thereafter, a Supplementary Deed of License was entered into between the petitioner and APSRTC represented by its Managing Director on 02.08.2010 for a period of 5 years i.e. from 29.03.2020 to 28.03.2025 (Ex.P9). The supplementary agreement was reduced into writing on 25.03.2021.

The Personnel Officer, APPTD (APSRTC), issued a tender notification dated 13.03.2025 (Ex.P1) for different items. The 4th item in the tender notification, is 'hotel and dormitory' admeasuring 31.700, for a period of five years. In the notification, it was mentioned that the existing license period will be completing by 28.03.2025.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner's representation dated 04.02.2025 (Ex.P2), has not been considered by the authority and issued tender notification impugned.

Learned Standing Counsel, on instructions would submit that the representation made by the petitioner dated 04.02.2025, will be considered as per law.

Whether the petitioner is entitled for extension of time as per the representation or not, will be considered by the appropriate authority as per the Rules in vogue.

Given the facts and circumstances of the case, as an interim measure, respondent No.2 shall consider the representation made by the petitioner dated 04.02.2025 (Ex.P2) and pass appropriate orders as per the Rules, before the proposed auction.

List the matter on 04.04.2025.

Dated: 21.03.2025
TVN

SUBBA REDDY SATTI, J