HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATHI

MAIN CASE No: W.P.No.8563 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No	DATE	ORDER	Office Note
2.	09.04.2026	**GRKP, J** Heard Sri S.M. Subhani, learned Counsel appearing for the Writ Petitioner and Sri S. Vijay Kumar, learned Counsel representing Sri A.S.C. Bose, learned Standing Counsel for Municipal Corporation. 2. The Plea raised by the learned Counsel appearing for the Official Respondents is that the Petitioner is bound by the terms of the Grant of Lease, under which the Petitioner is obligated to remove the Billboards if there is any road widening. 3. The Impugned Notice indicates that the Petitioner was asked to remove the Billboards to facilitate the road widening process, while it is also stated that the other advertisers are allowed to continue because they have renewed their Leases. 4. This Court fails to countenance how the Official Respondents can allow the other Billboards to remain if the road widening is to take place. On the face of it, it appears that the stand taken by the Official Respondents is inconsistent.	Contd…

		5. It is settled law that litigants cannot be allowed to approbate and reprobate by blowing hot and cold at the same time. In this view of the matter, the Order of *Status-quo* shall continue until further orders. 6. *Prima facie*, it appears to this Court that the Respondents are acting mala fide. 7. The Commissioner of Ongole Municipal Corporation is directed to file Counter-Affidavit to show cause as to why Proceedings should not be initiated for acting mala fide in the case of the Petitioner. 8. Let Counter Affidavit be filed within four weeks. Two weeks thereafter for filing Re-joinder. 9. Needless to state that the Writ Petitioner is duty-bound to pay the Lease rentals upon demand raised by the Official Respondents. If there is any default in that regard, the Interim Order granted in favour of the Writ Petitioner shall stand automatically vacated. 10. List on 24.06.2026. **GRKP, J** DSV	