



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI**

Bench
Sr.No:-42
[3579]

WRIT APPEAL NO: 419 of 2026

Shaik Afreen

...Appellant

Vs.

M. Lakshmi Rajyam and Others

...Respondent(s)

Advocate for Appellant:

Mr. Guttapalem Vijaya Kumar

Advocate(s) for Respondent(s):

Mr. Papudippu Sashidar Reddy,
GP for Civil Supplies

**CORAM : THE CHIEF JUSTICE LISA GILL
SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA**

DATE : 22nd June, 2026.

LISA GILL, CJ (Oral) :

This appeal has been filed by appellant who was otherwise not impleaded as respondent in Writ Petition No.34868 of 2025. Appellant has challenged order dated 15.12.2025, passed by learned Single Bench, whereby Writ Petition No.34868 of 2025, filed by respondent No.1/ writ petitioner was disposed of, while directing official respondents to supply essential commodities to petitioner's Fair Price Shop and to allow her to distribute the same to cardholders until any disciplinary action was initiated against her in accordance with law.

2. Writ petitioner claimed that she had been appointed as fair price shop dealer for shop No.1136011 at Lakkireddy Palli Village on 09.03.2012.

Authorisation in her favour was extended from time to time. Show-cause notice dated 13.08.2025 was issued to her alleging violation of certain clauses of Andhra Pradesh State Targeted Public Distribution System (Control) Orders, 2018 (for short, "Control Order, 2018"). Grievance raised by writ petitioner was that, without there being any suspension or cancellation of licence pursuant to explanation submitted by her, respondents had illegally stopped supply of essential commodities.

3. Respondents, before the learned Single Bench, took a plea that no explanation was submitted by writ petitioner and to ensure that there is no disruption in the distribution of commodities fingerprint authentication had been temporarily transferred to one Sri J. Rajendra Prasad, Village Revenue Assistant.

4. Learned Single Bench observed that petitioner's authorization had neither been suspended nor cancelled and that the matter was squarely covered by decision of this Court in **Oleti Tirupathamma v. District Supply Officer (City), Visakhapatnam 2002 (1) ALD 577**. Writ petition was disposed of as described in the foregoing paragraphs.

5. Present appellant filed this appeal with the averment that in the interregnum a temporary arrangement had been made in favour of present appellant for running the Fair Price Shop for a period of three months from 08.09.2025 to 08.12.2025. She continued to run the Fair Price Shop when writ

petition was filed and disposed of. These facts were not brought to notice of the learned Single Bench.

6. Leave to appeal was afforded to present appellant on 17.04.2026 by coordinate Bench and she was permitted to continue as temporary dealer till the next date of hearing.

7. It was noticed by this Court that temporary arrangement in favour of the appellant was only for a period of three months which came to an end on 08.12.2025 and that there was no extension of this period and that fingerprint authorization had earlier been stated to be temporarily transferred to said J. Rajendra Prasad, Village Revenue Assistant to facilitate smooth distribution of essential commodities to cardholders and Anganwadi Centres. It is duly noted by this Court in order dated 05.05.2026, that appellant, however, continued to hold temporary charge of the shop in question. It was thus directed that temporary authorization would be given to competent Village Revenue Assistant to ensure seamless distribution of essential commodities. Official respondents were also directed to conclude the proceedings initiated *vide* show-cause notice, dated 13.08.2025, in accordance with law. Interim order dated 17.04.2026, was modified to that extent.

8. Learned counsel for official respondents, today informs that, subsequently, order dated 20.06.2026, has been passed by Revenue Divisional Officer, Rayachoti, Annamayya District, wherein it has been found that respondent No.1/ writ petitioner is not entitled for restoration of Fair Price

Shop authorization and that proceedings initiated against her under provisions of Control Order, 2018 warrant further action.

9. Copy of order dated 20.06.2026, furnished in Court today with a copy thereof to learned counsel for appellant as well as the writ petitioner, is taken on record subject to just exceptions.

10. Keeping in view the subsequent developments, this Writ Appeal is disposed of, while leaving the writ petitioner at liberty to avail the remedy/remedies as may be available to her in accordance with law for challenging order dated 20.06.2026. In our considered opinion, present appellant after completion of the tenure of temporary arrangement in her favour, in December, 2025, also does not have any vested right for running the Fair Price Shop in question. The authorities are at liberty to make necessary temporary arrangement as may be deemed fit and take action in accordance with law for filling up the vacancy.

No costs. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of accordingly.

LISA GILL, CJ.

NINALA JAYASURYA, J.

SSN

Whether the order is Speaking/Reasoned : Yes / No

Whether the order is Reportable/Non-reportable : Yes / No