

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH :: AMARAVATHI

MAIN CASE NO: W.P.No.8982 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
01.	24.04.2026	<u>MRK, J</u> 1. Heard Sri Posani Venkateswarlu, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Mines and Geology. 2. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner primarily contends that, despite the specific directions issued by this Court in W.P. No. 24537 of 2025 dated 12.09.2025, the respondents' authorities merely furnished a copy of inspection report dated 15.12.2023 without undertaking any further exercise as directed. 3. In reply, the petitioner submitted a detailed explanation raising intricate issues and disputing the methodology adopted by the authorities in assessing the quantity of road metal excavated, particularly with regard to compliance with the prescribed parameters. 4. The learned Senior Counsel further submits that the impugned order dated 27.12.2025 passed by the 3rd respondent is bereft of reasons. He placed reliance on the recent judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in <i>Botta Lakshmi Pavani vs. State of Andhra Pradesh and Others</i> (2025 SCC	(contd..)

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		OnLine AP 901), and contends that the impugned order is merely a reiteration of earlier allegations, without any independent or reasoned consideration by the authority. 5. Conversely, the learned Assistant Government Pleader submits that the impugned order has been passed strictly in compliance with the directions issued by this Court in W.P. No. 24537 of 2025. In nut-shell, she supports the impugned order as being within the legal parameters, contending that it is an order passed by a quasi-judicial authority upon due consideration. 6. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, and in particular the primary contention regarding violation of the principles of natural justice, which must be adhered to in both letter and spirit as enunciated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Krishnadatt Awasthi vs. State of Madhya Pradesh [(2025) 7 SCC 545], and also considering the dictum in Botta Lakshmi Pavani Vs. State of A.P. of Division Bench, this Court is <i>prima-facie</i> inclined to grant an interim suspension of Notice No.1604/RE&VO/2025-2 dt:27.12.2025 of the 3rd respondent, for a period of eight (08) weeks. 7. Post after six (06) weeks. MRK, J RMR	

