



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

[3327]

THURSDAY, THE 16th DAY OF JULY 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 13556/2026

Between:

1.G. KRISHNA MOHAN NAIDU, S/O G. SREERAMULU, AGED 53 YEARS, OCC CONTRACTOR, R/O CHINNAYELLAM PALLI VILLAGE, NALLACHERUVU MANDAL SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT (ERSTWHILE ANANTAPURAM DIST.).

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, PANCHAYAT RAJ AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.

2.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, FINANCE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.

3.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, SRI SATYA SAI DISTRICT, PUTTAPARTHY.

4.THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, PRI DIVISION, PENUKONDA.

5.THE PAY AND ACCOUNTS OFFICER, ANANTAPURAMU DISTRICT, ANANTAPURAMU.

...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 may be pleased to issue a writ order or direction more particularly

one in the nature of writ of MANDAMUS declaring the action of the respondents in not releasing the amount of Rs.7,00,736/- (Seven lakhs Seven Hundred Thirty Six Rupees) to the petitioner even after the timely execution of the work Providing BT Renewals to the road from Pedaballi - Settipalli road to Buggapalli (V) of Puttaparthi Mandal vide Agreement.No.7/2020-21 dated 23.03.2021 as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and also opposed to the settled principles of law, and consequently direct the respondents to forthwith pay Rs.7,00,736/- (Seven lakhs Seven Hundred Thirty Six Rupees) to the petitioner along with 12percent interest per annum and pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner:

- 1.SAI MANOJ REDDY L

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

- 1.GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV
- 2.GP FOR REVENUE
- 3.GP FOR FINANCE PLANNING

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY

Writ Petition No:13556 of 2026

The Court made the following Order:

This Writ Petition is filed seeking the following relief:

“...to issue a writ order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of MANDAMUS declaring the action of the respondents in not releasing the amount of Rs.7,00,736/- (Seven lakhs Seven Hundred Thirty Six Rupees) to the petitioner even after the timely execution of the work “Providing BT Renewals to the road from Pedaballi - Settipalli road to Buggapalli (V) of Puttaparthi Mandal” vide Agreement.No.7/2020-21 dated 23.03.2021 as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and also opposed to the settled principles of law, and consequently direct the respondents to forthwith pay Rs.7,00,736/- (Seven lakhs Seven Hundred Thirty Six Rupees) to the petitioner along with 12% interest per annum and pass such other order or orders...”

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

3. The petitioner is a Class-I Contractor who undertook the work sanctioned vide G.O.Rt.No.14 dated 03.01.2019 of “Providing BT Renewals to the road from Pedaballi–Settipalli Road to Buggapalli (V), Puttaparthi Mandal” under Agreement No. 7/2020-21, dated 23.03.2021. The work was duly completed within the stipulated period and was inspected, verified, entered in the M-Book, and quality control inspection was also completed by the respondents after due verification of the work. Despite completion and acceptance of the work, the respondents have failed to release the admitted

bill amount of Rs.7,00,736/- to the him. Despite repeated requests made by the petitioner for payment of the bill, respondents continued to drag the matter on one pretext or another. It is the case of the petitioner that he borrowed money on interest to execute the work and is suffering serious financial hardship due to non-payment of admitted bill amount.

4. It is the grievance of the petitioner that notwithstanding the completion of the work and its measurement by the competent authorities, the amount due towards the executed work has not been paid till date. According to the petitioner, although the work was completed more than 4½ years ago, the respondent authorities have not released 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, on written instructions dated 15.07.2026, from the Executive Engineer, PR PIU Division, Puttaparthi, Sri Sathya Sai District, submits that there is no dispute with regard to the execution of the work. According to him, the petitioner is entitled to an amount of Rs.6,29,744/- after statutory deductions such as IT, SGST, CGST, Seigniorage charges, LC and FSD, aggregating to Rs.70,992/-, and that LS 2nd & Final Bill for the work was scrutinized and prepared by the office of Executive Engineer, PR PIU Division, Puttaparthi, Sri Sathya Sai District for a gross amount of Rs.7,00,736/- and a net amount of Rs.6,29,744/- and that the bill was submitted to the office of the Executive Engineer, PR PIU Division,

Ananthapuramu, for payment, requests for release of budget to process the bill were also submitted to the higher authorities *vide* office letters dated 01.06.2026 and 11.05.2026, and six months' time is sought 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 work executed by the petitioner and the amount payable to him, and in view of the submissions of the learned Assistant Government Pleader, the respondent authorities are directed to pay a sum of Rs.6,29,744/- (Rupees six lakhs twenty nine thousand seven hundred and forty four only) to the petitioner

¹ 2025 SCC online SC 1400

within a period of six (06) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

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:16.07.2026.
Ksj