



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

[3327]

TUESDAY, THE 14th DAY OF JULY 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K. SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 10686/2026

Between:

1.SRI PULIVARTI LAKSHMI NARAYANA,, AGED ABOUT 63 YEARS,SANAMPUDI, SINGARAYAKONDA, PRAKASAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH..

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, PANCHYAT RAJ DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR DISTRICT-522237

2.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND PLANNING, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.- 522237

3.THE COMMISSIONER, PANCHAYAT RAJ AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT, TADEPALLE, GUNTUR DISTRICT-522501

4.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, PRAKASAM DISTRICT-523001

5.THE PROJECT DIRECTOR, ,DWMA, ONGOLE, PRAKASAM DISTRICT-523001

6.THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, P.R.I DIVISION, KANDUKUR,PRAKASAM DISTRICT-523001

7.THE SANAMPUDI GRAM PANCHAYAT, REP, BY ITS SECRETARY, SANAMPUDI (V), PRAKASAM DISTRICT-523001

...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 an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondent authorities in not releasing an amount of Rs.3,82,070/- to the petitioner for the execution of above mentioned works, respectively as arbitrary, illegal, contrary to Law and against the Principles of Natural Justice and against the Norms of the Public Policy and to issue consequential direction directing the respondent authorities to release the amounts payable to the petitioner with an interest at 6percent per annum and to pass such

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 respondent authorities to release an amount of Rs.3,82,070/- to the petitioner for execution of the above mentioned work, pending disposal of the above writ petition and to pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner:

- 1.VENKAT SAILENDRA G

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

- 1.GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV
- 2.GP FOR REVENUE
- 3.GP FOR FINANCE PLANNING
- 4.Mattegunta.Sudhir,Standing Counsel For Z.P.Ps,M.P.Ps,Gram Panchayats

The Court made the following:

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed seeking the following relief:

“....to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondent authorities in not releasing an amount of Rs.3,82,070/- to the petitioner for the execution of above mentioned works, respectively as arbitrary, illegal, contrary to Law and against the Principles of Natural Justice and against the Norms of the Public Policy and to issue consequential direction directing the respondent authorities to release the amounts payable to the petitioner with an interest at 6% per annum and pass such other order...”

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj and Rural Development and the learned Standing Counsel for the Gram Panchayat.

3. The petitioner claims to be a registered contractor engaged in the execution of civil works and that he was entrusted with various works of the Panchayat Raj Department and the Roads & Buildings Department on a tender basis. It is the case of the petitioner that he was awarded a contract for execution of the MGNREGS works at Sanampudi Gram Panchaya, Sanampudi Village, Prakasam District. It is the case of the petitioner that he deposited the requisite security amount and executed the works to the satisfaction of the authorities concerned, and upon completion of the works, the respondent authorities measured the same and recorded the measurements in the Measurement Books.

4. It is the grievance of the petitioner that notwithstanding the completion of the works and its measurement by the competent authorities, the amount due towards the executed works has not been paid till date. According to the petitioner, although the works were completed long back, the respondent authorities are not releasing the admitted amount payable to him. Aggrieved by the non-payment of the said amount, the petitioner filed the present Writ Petition.

5. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj and Rural Development, on written instructions, from the Executive Engineer, PRI Division, Kandukur-6th respondent, submits that there is no dispute with regard to the execution of the subject works by the petitioner. She further submits that the petitioner is entitled to an amount of Rs.3,82,070/- after statutory deductions, if any, and that proposals for release of grant were submitted to the authorities concerned, and sought time for payment of the said amount. The written instructions are placed on record.

6. Since the amount payable is admitted and undisputed, the Writ Petition is maintainable. In ***M/s.Utkal Highways Engineers and Contractors v. Chief General Manager & Ors***¹, it was held at Para No.8 as under:

“Be that as it may, the High Court has not dealt with the merits of the Writ Petition. Moreover, it is not an inviolable rule that no money claim can be adjudicated upon in exercise of writ jurisdiction. Non-payment of admitted dues, inter alia, may be considered an arbitrary action on the part of respondents and for claiming the same, a Writ Petition may lie. Further, throwing a Writ Petition on ground of availability of alternative remedy after 10 years, particularly, when parties have exchanged their affidavits, is not the correct course unless there are disputed questions of fact which by their very nature cannot be adjudicated upon without recording formal evidence.”

7. Having regard to the fact that there is no dispute with regard to the works executed by the petitioner and the amount payable to him, and in view of the submissions of the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj and Rural Development, the respondent authorities are directed to pay a sum of Rs.3,82,070/- to the petitioner within a period of six (6) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

¹ 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1400

8. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, the miscellaneous applications, if any, pending in this Writ Petition, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE K. SREENIVASA REDDY

Date: 14.07.2026.

MS

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K. SREENIVASA REDDY

Writ Petition No:10686 of 2026

Date: 14.07.2026

MS