



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

**[3457]**

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

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 10358/2026**

**Between:**

1. R G BHOOPESH, S/O LATE R.GOPINATHAN, AGED ABOUT 48 YEARS, R/O D.NO.5 - 1018, SANTHAPET, ARGONDA ROAD CHITTOOR TOWN, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDING, VELAGAPUDI 522238

2. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, ENERGY DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDING, VELAGAPUDI. 522238

3. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, FINANCE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDING, VELAGAPUDI.

4. CHITTOOR MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, CHITTOOR CITY, REPRESENTED BY ITS COMMISSIONER 517501

5. SOUTHERN POWER DISTRIBUTION COMPANY OF AP LTD, REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, KESAVAYAGUNTA, BESIDES SRINIVASA KALYANA MANTAPAM TIRUCHANURU ROAD, TIRUPATHI. 517501

6.THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, OPERATION CIRCLE,  
APSPDCL, TIRUPATI

7.THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, OPERATION, APSPDCL, CHITTOOR.  
517501

8.THE DIRECTORATE OF TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING,  
ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS DIRECTOR.

**...RESPONDENT(S):**

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue a Writ more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, Declaring the inaction of the Respondents herein in refunding / returning the amount of Rs.7,60,868/- to the Petitioner, which was collected as Additional Security Deposit Charges, by relying upon Memo No.CGM/O AND M/GM/Comml./F/ 293682D.No.98/22 01.02.2022 as being illegal, arbitrary, unjust, violative of Articles 14, 19(1)(g), 21 and 300A of the Constitution of India, violative of the Electricity Act, 2003, violative of Regulation No.6 of 2004, violative of AP land development (Layout and Sub-division) rules 2017 and violative of AP Metropolitan Region and Urban Development Authorities Act, 2016, Consequently set aside Memo No.CGM/O AND M/GM/Comml./F/ 293682D.No.98/22 dated 01.02.2022, Direct the Respondents to refund Rs. 7,60,868/- to the Petitioner at the interest determined by the Reserve Bank of India I. dated II. And pass

**IA NO: 1 OF 2026**

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the Respondents herein to refund Rs. 7,60,868/- to the Petitioner Company and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1.VIVEKANANDA VIRUPAKSHA

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1.GP FOR MUNICIPAL ADMN URBAN DEV

2.GP FOR ENERGY

3.GP FOR FINANCE PLANNING

**The Court made the following:****Order:-**

The petitioner has developed a residential layout in Thimmasamudram Village, Chittoor District, and, on demand from the respondent authorities, deposited security deposit as well as additional security deposit. The 5<sup>th</sup> respondent, vide memo dated 01.02.2022, issued revised guidelines for electrification of layouts.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the respondents are liable to refund the additional security deposit and refers to clause (iii) (b) of the memo referred to above. It is submitted that, as per the said clause, the respondents are required to refund the additional security deposit subject to the agreement period being valid for a period of five (05) years or till 50% occupation of the proposed plots by the residents, whichever is earlier. It is further submitted that more than 90% of the plots are occupied and, as such, the petitioner is entitled to refund of the additional security deposit.

3. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent submits that the petitioner has submitted a representation dated 10.01.2026, which is filed as material paper in W.P. No. 10344 of 2026, and that the said representation does not reflect the petitioner's contention that 90% of the layout is complete, which would entitle him to seek refund of the additional security deposit.

4. Considering the submissions, this writ petition is disposed of, leaving it open for the petitioner to submit a fresh representation duly informing the extent of occupation of the layout, in terms of clause (iii)(b) of the memo dated 01.02.2022. Upon receipt of the same, the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent shall consider the representation of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders within a period of four (04) weeks thereafter. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

---

**JUSTICE HARINATH.N**

20.04.2026  
PNS