



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

[3332]

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

WRIT PETITION NO: 16059/2026

Between:

Akula Venkateswara Rao and Others

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

The Union Of India and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. G SIMHADRI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR ROADS BUILDINGS

2. GP FOR LAND ACQUISITION

3.

4. MUDUNURI ANAND KUMAR (SC FOR NHAI)

The Court made the following:

INTERIM ORDER:

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the respondents without following due process of law and without issuing notice are trying to interfere with their possession over the subject properties. He further submitted that if the said action is materialized, it affects the rights of the petitioners, as such, prayed to pass appropriate orders.

2. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents on instructions submitted that notice has been issued on the petitioners. A copy of the said notice has been placed on record along with the instructions. As such, the petitioners cannot say that no notice has been issued, accordingly, prayed to dismiss the writ petition.

3. Perused the record.

4. A perusal of the notice would show that it was addressed to the petitioner with blank particulars. It can be further seen that, it was like a proforma notice and also the purpose of issuing the notice was not mentioned in it. Further, in the said notice the subject was referred as 'notice under Sub Section 2 of Section 26 of Act, 2007, however, the learned counsel for the respondents contended that the provision mentioned in the said notice was wrong and relied on Section 26(2) of the Control of National Highways (Land and Traffic) Act, 2002. This shows that the authorities issued the said notice without proper application of mind. Even otherwise, the petitioner is disputing about the

issuance of notice. Further, there is no material placed before this Court to satisfy that the said notice has been served on the petitioners.

5. *Prima facie*, a point has been made out for consideration, as such, this Court is inclined to pass the following interim order:

“Respondents are directed not to interfere with the petitioners subject properties except under due process of law.”

6. For counters, post on 22.07.2026.

JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

Date: 24th June, 2026

Note: Issue C.C. by 24.06.2026

b/o

RKS