



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

[3331]

THURSDAY, THE ELEVENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 15379/2026

Between:

Nagiseti Pavan Teja

...PETITIONER

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.V SAI KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP MUNICIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP

The Court made the following order:

Heard Sri V.Sai Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri V.Sireesha Rani, learned Standing Counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

Impugning the endorsement *vide* B.P.T.No.20260531304 dated 06.06.2026 (Ex.P.1), above writ petition was filed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that a show cause notice (Ex.P-3) was issued to the petitioner and the petitioner submitted explanation (Ex.P-2). Without considering the explanation, Ex.P-1 endorsement was issued.

Learned Standing Counsel would submit that petitioner constructed cellar and G+4, contrary to the sanctioned plan, without obtaining building

permission. She would further submit that petitioner let out the cellar portion to run the shops. Learned counsel seeks time to produce photographs.

In reply, Sri V.Sai Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit petitioner got building permission (Ex.P-7).

As seen from Ex.P-1, the endorsement impugned in the writ petition, the authority opined that explanation submitted by the petitioner is not satisfactory and further action will be initiated in terms of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1965. The endorsement does not indicate demolition of the structures immediately. Since no penal action was indicated in Ex.P-1, list the matter on 16.06.2026 in the 'Motion List'.

Dated: 11.06.2026
KBN

SUBBA REDDY SATTI, J