



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

**[3331]**

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF MARCH  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 8140/2026**

**Between:**

Vudumudi Jaya Prasad, and Others

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**AND**

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

**...RESPONDENT(S)**

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

1. KARRE SATYANANDAM

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

1. GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

2. GP FOR REVENUE

**The Court made the following: ORDER**

Learned Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj & Rural Development takes notice on behalf of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent, and learned Government Pleader for Revenue takes notice on behalf of respondents 2 & 3, and both the counsel seek time to get the instructions.

2. Sri Y.Koteswara Rao, learned standing counsel, takes notice on behalf of the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent, offers to file vakalat and seeks time to file counter affidavit.

3. Assailing the proceedings issued by the Panchayat Secretary of the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent vide Roc.No.302/2025, dated 06.03.2026 (Ex.P1), the petitioners filed the above writ petition.

4. Heard Sri K.Satyanandam, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri Chaitanya, learned counsel representing Sri Y.Koteswara Rao, learned standing counsel for the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent.

5. The petitioners earlier filed W.P.Nos.31339 and 32876 of 2025, and they were disposed of on 12.11.2025 and 10.12.2025, respectively. While disposing of W.P.No.32876 of 2025, the coordinate Bench of this Court observed thus:

“The respondent authorities are directed to consider the explanation submitted by the petitioner in response to the notice dated 07.11.2025 and pass appropriate orders thereon in accordance with law, after affording an opportunity of being heard, as expeditiously as possible ...”

6. As seen from Ex.P1, the petitioners submitted explanation on 14.11.2025. The proceeding, impugned, runs into 6 pages. In internal Page-4 of the order, the authority observed thus:

“In this connection, the petitioners in W.P.Nos.31339/2025, W.P.No.31699/2025, and W.P.No.32876/2025 were submitted their explanations on 14.11.2025/21.11.2025 (i.e.) after the orders passed by the Hon’ble Court. In pursuance of the orders passed by the Hon’ble Court in W.P.Nos.31339/2025, W.P.No.31699/2025, and W.P.No.32876/2025, conducted a detailed enquiry on their explanations **in the Village**. On the enquiry, it reveals that the petitioners were encroached the Street Poramboke land and their Social status as detailed below.”

In internal Page-5 of the order, after tabular form, the authority observed that the petitioners encroached the Government-Street Poramboke and the explanations of the petitioners are not true, tenable and far from the truth. The explanations of the petitioners cannot be countenanced and deserve no consideration.

7. It is very unfortunate that despite the order dated 10.12.2025 in W.P.No.32876 of 2025, wherein the coordinate Bench of this Court directed the learned officer to provide an opportunity of hearing, no opportunity of hearing was provided to the petitioners. Apart from that, the order impugned does not indicate objective consideration of the explanations submitted by the petitioners. Except for stating that the explanation cannot be countenanced, nothing is discernible as to what the explanation is and why the same cannot be countenanced. The reasons are the heart and soul of any order. The petitioners have made out a *prima facie* case for the grant of an interim order.

8. Given the facts and circumstances of the case, the Panchayat Secretary of 4<sup>th</sup> respondent shall not take any coercive steps in respect of petitioners' shops/ houses bearing D.No.5-14, old D.No.5-113b (new D.No.4-107), 5-122, 5-13 and 5-115, Main Road, Badampudi village, Unguturu Mandal, Eluru District.

9. List the matter on 31.03.2026 in the adjourned Motion List.