



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

[3558]

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY THIRD DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY

AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

WRIT APPEAL NO: 486/2026

Between:

1.P. BALANJANEYA REDDY, S/O LATE SIVANARAYANA
REDDY, AGED ABOUT 49 YEARS, HINDU, R/O
YEDUGUNDLAPADU VILLAGE, MADDIPADU MANDAL,
PRAKASAM DISTRICT 523262.

...APPELLANT

AND

1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT,
VEIAGAPUDI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.522238

2.THE DISTRICT COLIETOR, PRAKASAM DISTRICT,
ONGOIE.523001

3.THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, ONGOLE DIVISION,
ONGOLE.523001

4.THE TAHSILDAR, MADDIPADU MANDAL, PRAKASAM
DISTRICT.523211

5.THE DISTRICT PANCHAYAT OFFICER, PRAKASAM

DISTRICT, ONGOLE.523001

6.THE EDUGUNDLAPADU GRAMPANCHAYAT, REP. BY ITS
PANCHAYAT SECRETARY, MADDIPADU MANDAL,
PRAKASAM DISTRICT.523211

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Appellant:

1.SOURI BABU DUPPATI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

2.GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following:

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY
AND**

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

WRIT APPEAL No.486 of 2026

JUDGMENT: *(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice Cheekati Manavendranath Roy)*

Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue for respondent Nos.1 to 4 and learned Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj & Rural Development for respondent No.5. None appears for respondent No.6.

2. The appellant herein has filed writ petition in W.P.No.8288 of 2026, questioning the alleged unauthorized constructions said to have been made by private persons in the water body of Yedugundlapadu Village, Maddipadu Mandal of Prakasam District. Alongside the writ petition, it appears an interlocutory application was also filed by the appellant/writ petitioner seeking interim relief to restrain private persons from making any illegal constructions in the water body.

3. When the writ petition came up for admission before the learned single Judge on 31.03.2026, the following docket order has been passed by the learned single Judge.

"Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

The learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue takes notice for the respondent Nos.1 to 4 to file counter-affidavit.

The petitioner shall also implead the proper and necessary parties in this Writ Petition, who are going to

make illegal constructions in the subject land as alleged by the petitioner.

The Registry is directed to print the names of the learned Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj for the 5th respondent and the learned Standing Counsel for the 6th respondent.

List on 15.04.2026.”

4. Alleging that the interlocutory application that was filed by the writ petitioner was not considered and no interim relief was granted, the instant writ appeal has been preferred. But, as can be seen from the above order passed by the learned single Judge, the learned single Judge did not decline to grant any interim relief as sought for. In fact, no order was passed on the said interlocutory application.

5. Therefore, when the interlocutory application was not rejected and when no adverse order was passed against the writ petitioner, it is really beyond our comprehension as to how the present writ appeal is maintainable against the above order. The learned single Judge has only recorded that the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Revenue has taken notice for respondent Nos.1 to 4 and that he has requested time to file counter-affidavit and directed the writ petitioner to implead the proper and necessary parties in the writ petition, who are allegedly making illegal constructions in the subject land, and further directed the Registry to print the name of Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj for the 5th respondent and the name of Standing Counsel for the 6th respondent. Except the above order, nothing else has been held and no adverse order against the writ petitioner was

passed. Therefore, we absolutely find no valid legal ground to interfere in this appeal and to entertain the appeal.

6. Therefore, the writ appeal is dismissed as not maintainable. However, the appellant/writ petitioner is at liberty, if at all there is any urgency, to approach the learned single Judge for passing appropriate orders on his interlocutory application.

As a sequel, interlocutory applications, if any pending, in this case shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY

JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

Date: 23.04.2026
IBL

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

WRIT APPEAL No.486 of 2026

Dt: 23.04.2026

IBL