

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH :: AMARAVATHI

MAIN CASE NO: W.P.No.12356 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	30.04.2026	<u>MRK, J</u> 1. Heard Sri K.Rathanga Pani Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Sri Md. Saleem, learned Standing Counsel for respondent Nos. 1 to 3. 2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a Stage-I Transport Contractor with sufficient experience. 3. The 2nd respondent issued a work order vide Proc. No. PDS/Jowar/2025-26 dated 14.04.2026 for procurement of Jowar during the Rabi Marketing Season 2025-2026—Stage-I transportation from Farm Gate/RSKs to MLS Points/Buffer Godowns/Inter-District destinations. 4. He further elaborated that in the said work order, the 2nd respondent, after considering the suitability and past experience of the petitioner only, issued the work order (Ex.P.12), stipulating conditions such as Installation of GPS, API Integration (Mandatory), Adequate Deployment of vehicles (Mandatory), Truck Chit System, Operational Discipline, etc. 5. Counsel for the petitioner further submits that, in pursuance of the said work order dt:14.04.2026, the petitioner has made all	(contd..

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		necessary arrangements by incurring huge expenditure and is ready to commence operations. 6. It is also contended that the 3rd respondent, without issuing any prior notice, unilaterally issued another work order vide Lr. No. PDS/Jowar/2025-26 dated 25.04.2026 in respect of the very same subject work in favour of the 4th respondent by superseding the earlier work order dt:14.04.2026 issued to the petitioner (Ex.P.1). 7. Learned counsel for the petitioner further asserts that the said action of the 3rd respondent is contrary to the principles of natural justice, as no prior notice was given to the petitioner. It also urged that when the earlier work order dated 14.04.2026 is still subsisting and has neither been set aside nor modified, issuance of subsequent work order dt:25.04.2026 in favour of the un-official respondent is arbitrary. 8. Learned counsel also placed reliance on the guidelines issued by the 1st respondent vide Lr. No. Proc./M2/KMS-2025-26 dated 24.04.2026, which are in support of his case but not as projected in the impugned orders. 9. It is further submitted that even such guidelines operate prospectively and not retrospectively. Additional grounds, including loss to the public exchequer and unjust enrichment,	(contd..)

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		are also urged. 10. Conversely, Sri Md. Saleem, learned Standing Counsel seeks time to obtain written instructions in the matter. 11. Having regard to the above facts and circumstances, it is not in dispute that the work order dated 14.04.2026 stands in the name of the petitioner, which mandated the petitioner to go for necessary arrangements in establishing the required infrastructure components, including GPS, API integration, and adequate deployment of vehicles. 12. It is relevant to note that the guidelines issued by the 1st respondent vide Lr. No. Proc./M2/KMS-2025-26 dated 24.04.2026 provide as follows: ii. Preference shall be given to the already appointed Paddy Transport Contractors in the concerned district for undertaking transportation of coarse grains. iii. Wherever the Paddy Transport Contractors are not appointed or are not willing to undertake transportation of coarse grains, the concerned Joint Collector & EOED may engage any other willing contractor at the approved paddy transportation rates.	(contd..)

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		In fact, the above guidelines are also supports the petitioner's assertions as he being the existing transport contractor. 13. Once the said work order is subsisting, issuance of subsequent work order in favour of the unofficial respondent, without prior notice to the petitioner and also without setting aside the earlier work order, prima facie appears to be in violation of principles of natural justice. 14. In this context, it is also appropriate to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in <i>Krishnadatt Awasthi vs. State of Madhya Pradesh [(2025) 7 SCC 545]</i>, which emphasizes the importance of adherence to the principles of natural justice in both quasi-judicial and administrative actions. 15. The respondent authorities, being the officers of instrumentalities of State, are bound to follow the principles of natural justice in its true letter and spirit. 16. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that, as on date, the work order issued in favour of the 4th respondent has not yet been commenced. 17. In view of the above, there shall be an interim direction as prayed for, for a period of eight (08) weeks. Meanwhile, the respondents are directed to file a comprehensive counter addressing all the issues raised in the writ	

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		affidavit. 18. Petitioner is permitted to take out personal notice on the 4th respondent through speed post and file proof of service by the next date of listing. RMR MRK, J	

SL. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE