

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATHI  
(SPECIAL ORIGINAL JURISDICTION)

FRIDAY, THE TENTH DAY OF APRIL,  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD  
WRIT PETITION NO: 8506 OF 2026



**Between:**

1. Mandadi Ramanayya, S/o.Malakondayya, Aged about 61 years, R/o.D.No.49-36-25/1, NGOs Colony, Akkayyapalem, Visakhapatnam, Visakhapatnam District.
2. Manikonda Vimala, W/o.Late Manikonda China Kondayya, Aged about 61 years, R/o.D.No.49-38-9/10, NGOs Colony, Akkayyapalem, Visakhapatnam, Visakhapatnam District.

...Petitioners

**AND**

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Municipal Administration & Urban Development Dept., Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravati, Guntur District.
2. Visakhapatnam Metropolitan Region Development Authority (VMRDA), Siripuram Junction, Visakhapatnam, Rep. by its Metropolitan Commissioner.

...Respondents

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is filed 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, one in the nature of Mandamus, . declaring the action of the 2nd respondent in continuously interfering with the Petitioners' enjoyment and possession of Plot No.9 (Extent 600 sq.yds) and Plot No. 10 (600 sq.yds), covered by the VUDA Approved Layout - L.P.No.16 of 2011, situated in Sy.No.270/2P of Madhurawada Village,

Visakhapatnam Rural Mandal, Visakhapatnam District, as wholly without Jurisdiction, without authority of law, violative of Principles of Natural Justice as also violative of the protection accorded by the provisions of Articles 14, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the 2nd respondent to refrain from doing so, in any manner, whatsoever and to allow the petitioners to go ahead with the legitimate construction activity over the said plots;

**IA NO: 1 OF 2026:**

Petition under Section 151 CPC is filed praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent not to interfere in any manner, whatsoever, with the construction activity being carried on by the Petitioners, on the strength of the GVMC Building Construction Permission No..1086/4037/B/MADW/M-5/2025, dt. 17.12.2025, relating to Plot Nos.9 and 10 (600 + 600 sq./yds respectively), in the VUDA Approved Layout - L.P. No. 16 of 2011, situated in Madhurawada Village, Visakhapatnam Rural Mandal, Visakhapatnam District, pending disposal of WP.No.8506 of 2026, on the file of the High Court.

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and the affidavit filed in support thereof and the earlier orders of the High court dated 06.04.2026 made herein and upon hearing the arguments of Sri V.Surya Kiran Kumar, Advocate for the Petitioners and GP for Municipal Admn and Urban Dev for the Respondent No.1 and Sri S.Ganesh Babu, Standing Counsel for Respondent No.2, the Court made the following;

**ORDER:**

**Heard Sri V. Surya Kiran Kumar, learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioners and Sri T. Karthik, Ld. Counsel appearing on behalf of Sri S. Ganesh Babu, learned Standing Counsel for Respondent No.2.**

2. Having considered the contents of the Affidavit filed in support of this Writ Petition, this Court notices that several connected matters are also either pending or disposed of by this Court. Every time, a similar matter comes up, the Written Instructions which have been rendered by the Visakhapatnam Metropolitan Region Development Authority (VMRDA) (Respondent No.2 in this Writ Petition) are absolutely inadequate, compelling this Court to adjourn the matter again and again. In any case, the Instructions rendered by the Standing Counsel are also so vague, due to lack of sufficient information to the Standing Counsel, that there is no clarity with regard to the following:

*(i) How many plots in the layout were allotted illegally?*

*(ii) What are the steps taken by the Respondent No.2 for cancellation of such plots?*

*(iii) What is the stage of the Vigilance Enquiry?*

*(iv) Whether the Respondent No.2 has identified the plots which have been allotted illegally and whether it had taken suitable steps in respect of all the plots or only regarding some of the plots?*

*(v) In respect of the suits which were filed but left unnumbered, no details are forthcoming as regards the date of filing and the stages of the unnumbered suits?*

*(vi) No information is forthcoming with regard to the suits which are either pending or dismissed for default?*

3. In this view of the matter, this Court deems it appropriate to summon the presence of the Metropolitan Commissioner (Respondent No.2) along with his assisting Officers with the entire record on the next date of hearing in order to assist this Court. The

Metropolitan Commissioner along with his assisting Officers shall appear before this Court with complete record for the purpose of assisting this Court.

4. Learned Standing Counsel for Respondent No.2 is directed to convey the gist of this Order to the Metropolitan Commissioner forthwith for effective compliance.

5. List on 17.04.2026.

Sd/-U.SRIDEVI  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

  
SECTION OFFICER

//TRUE COPY//

To,

1. Visakhapatnam Metropolitan Region Development Authority (VMRDA), Siripuram Junction, Visakhapatnam. (by **RPAD**)  
**(directed to appear before this Court along with his assisting officers on the next date of hearing i.e., on 17.04.2026)**
2. One CC to Sri. V.Surya Kiran Kumar, Advocate [OPUC]
3. Two CCs to GP for Muncipal Admn and Urban Dev, High Court of Andhra Pradesh. [OUT]
4. One CC to Sri S.Ganesh Babu, Standing Counsel [OPUC]
5. One spare copy



HIGH COURT

GRKP,J

DATED:10/04/2026

LIST ON 17.04.2026

ORDER

WP.No.8506 of 2026

APPEARANCE

