

APHC010188392026



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

[3328]

MONDAY, THE TWENTIETH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA
PRASAD**

WRIT PETITION NO: 10254/2026

Between:

1.KOLAGATLA VENKATA GOPALA RAO, S/O BHIMA RAO (LATE),
AGED ABOUT 61 YEARS, R/O 28-1-57, GOTTAPU VEEDHI, SALUR,
PARVATHIPURAM MANYAM DISTRICT 535591.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT
BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT
522238.

2.THE SALUR MUNICIPALITY, REP. BY ITS COMMISSIONER, SALUR
MUNICIPALITY OFFICE, SALUR, PARVATHIPURAM MANYAM
DISTRICT 535591

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.SASANKA BHUVANAGIRI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

The Court made the following:**ORAL ORDER:**

Heard Sri Sasanka Bhuvanagiri, learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner, Sri M. Srinu Babu, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Municipal Administration & Urban Development and Sri Karthik Raja, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of Smt. Sireesha Rani Vallabhaneni, learned Standing Counsel for Respondent No.2.

2. This Court has perused both the impugned Orders dated 02.02.2026 & 05.02.2026 (Ex.P.5 & P.6 respectively). This Court has also perused the Legal Notice issued by the Petitioner (Ex.P.7).

3. While the impugned Notices spoke about unauthorized construction undertaken by the Petitioner, surprisingly, the Legal Notice sent by the Petitioner dated 19.02.2026 (Ex.P.7) does not even whisper about the unauthorized/illegal construction undertaken by the Petitioner. Since the Petitioner has not furnished any explanation to the crux of the issue with regard to the illegal/unauthorized construction by him, this Court is not inclined to interfere in this Writ Petition.

4. However, as a matter of indulgence, this Court deems it appropriate to grant one week time to the Petitioner to explain precisely as to why action should not be initiated as regards the Notices issued to the Petitioner on 02.02.2026 & 05.02.2026. If the reply/explanation is not forthcoming from the Writ Petitioner within one week from the date of uploading of this Order on the website of this Court, the Respondent Authorities are at liberty to proceed in accordance with law. If the explanation is given within the time, the Respondent Authorities may consider the same in accordance with law and pass a Speaking Order and furnish a copy of such Order to the Writ Petitioner forthwith. Needless to state that the Respondents shall not initiate any coercive steps for seven (7) days from the date of serving a copy of the

Speaking Order on the Writ Petitioner, if the reply/explanation is submitted by the Writ Petitioner within the time granted.

5. With these observations and directions, this Writ Petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs.

6. Interlocutory Applications, if any, stand closed in terms of this order.

GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD, J

Dt: 20.04.2026

Vns