

APHC010190552026



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

[0]

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA
PRASAD**

WRIT PETITION NO: 10714/2026

Between:

1. TATAVARTHI SRINIVASU, S/O. T.P. MOHAN RAO GUPTA AGED ABOVE MAJOR, R/O. A.P.H.B. COLONY, BESIDES SUSHIL NEST HOTEL, BHIMAVARAM, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT, A.P-534203.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, MA AND UD DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS AT VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI.
2. THE COMMISSIONER, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION, AMARAVATAHI, ANDHRA PRADESH.
3. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT AT BHIMAVARAM-534203.
4. THE MUNICIPAL COMMISSIONER, BHIMAVARAM MUNICIPALITY, W.G DISTRICT ANDHRA PRADESH-534201
5. THE TAHSILDAR, BHIMAVARAM, W.G. DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH-534201
6. KORLAPRALA SUBBA RAO, S/O. NOT KNOWN THE PETITIONER AGED ABOVE MAJOR, R/O. BONDA VARI STREET, NEAR UNION BANK OF INDIA, BHIMAVARAM, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT-534201
7. KADALI BALU, S/O. NOT KNOWN THE PETITIONER. AGED ABOVE MAJOR, R/O. HOUSING BOARD COLONY, BHIMAVARAM, WEST GODAVARI DISTRICT-534203.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. Thota Dharmendra

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR REVENUE
2. GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

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

Heard Sri Siva Nagarjuna, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of Sri T. Dharmendra, learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner and Smt. Sireesha Rani Vallabhaneni, learned Standing Counsel for Respondent No.4.

2. Learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner has taken this Court through the photographs at page 23 to indicate that even on 06.04.2026, the owner of the site continued with the construction. Unfortunately, the Written Instructions rendered by the Commissioner, Bhimavaram Municipality, are as vague as they can be, compelling the Court to, *prima facie*, infer that the Commissioner is rather abetting illegality that is being practiced by the Unofficial Respondent Nos.6 & 7 herein. This observation is made by the Court because the Written Instructions does not even indicate the date and time during which the Unofficial Respondent Nos.6 & 7 were served with any Proceeding directing them not to proceed with construction.

3. In fact, it is the submission of the learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner that the Unofficial Respondents are carrying-on with the construction with the active connivance of the Official Respondents herein.

4. Having regard to these facts, this Court deems it appropriate to grant one more opportunity to the Commissioner (Respondent No.4) to render proper Written Instructions. If proper Written Instructions are not forthcoming from the Commissioner, this Court would consider directing the appearance of Commissioner on the next date.

5. Smt. Sireesha Rani Vallabhaneni, learned Standing Counsel for Respondent No.4, is directed to convey the gist of this Order to the Commissioner forthwith for effective compliance.

6. There shall be a direction to all the parties including Unofficial Respondent Nos.6 & 7 to maintain *Status-quo* obtaining as on today, till the next listing.

7. List on 24.04.2026 in the motion list.

GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD, J

Dt:22.04.2026

Note: Issue C.C today,
B/o,
Vns