

Reserved on : 09.04.2026
Pronounced on : 28.04.2026
Uploaded on : 30.04.2026

APHC010476512024



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

[3330]

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 24922/2024

BETWEEN:

- 1.AADIVAASI IKYA KAARYACHARANA COMMITTEE, REP., BY ITS CHAIRMAN, MODIYAM SRINIVASA RAO S/o. VENKATESU, AGE. 51 YEARS, OCC: SOCIAL SERVICE.,R/o. DR.No.5-67, JEELUGUMILLI (VILLAGE), JEELUGUMILLI MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT.
 - 2.SODEM MUKKAYYA, S/o. GANGARAJU, AGE. 38 YEARS, OCC: BUSSINESS, R/o. GOLLAGUDEM (V), BUTTAYAGUDEM (M), ELURU DISTRICT.
 - 3.DORA RAMARAO, S/o. SOMANNA DORA, AGE 46 YEARS, OCC: SOCIAL SERVICE, R/o. DR.No.20-150, LOCHALIPUTTU (VILLAGE), PADERU MANDAL, ALURI SITARAMA RAJU DISTRICT.
 - 4.KONDAGORRE SUBBARAO, S/o. GASANNA, AGE. 62 YEARS, OCC. SOCIAL SERVICE, R/o.5-27, PEDDURU (VILLAGE), SEETHAMPETA MANDAL, PARVATHIPURAM MANYAM DISTRICT.
- ...PETITIONER(S)**

AND

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

2. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, TRIBAL WELFARE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
3. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, PANCHAYATRAJ DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
4. THE COMMISSIONER OF PROHIBITION AND EXCISE, OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF PROHIBITION AND EXCISE, EXCISE COMPLEX, RS No.88-2B, SAI VIHAR APARTMENTS, POULTRY FARM ROAD, PRASADAMPADU (V), VIJAYAWADA-521108, AMARAVATHI, ANDHRA PRADESH.
5. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ALLURI SITHARAMA RAJU DISTRICT, PADERU.
6. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, PARVATHIPURAM MANYAM DISTRICT, PARVATHIPURAM.
7. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, ELURU DISTRICT, ELURU.
8. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF EXCISE, ELURU DISTRICT, ELURU.
9. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF EXCISE, ALLURI SITHARAMA RAJU DISTRICT, PADERU.
10. THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF EXCISE, PARVATHI PURAM MANYAM DISTRICT, PARVATHIPURAM.
11. MODIYAM SRINIVASA RAO S/o. GANGARAJU, AGED 51 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-83, RAJANAGARAM VILLAGE, BUTTAYAGUDEM MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT.
12. TAMA JAGADAMBA W/o. T CHINNA MUNIYYA, AGED 61 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-65, JAINAVARIGUDEM VILLAGE, BUTTAYAGUDEM MANDAL ELURU DISTRICT.
13. PANDU SREERAM S/o. BALARAJU, AGED 26 YEARS, R/o. BARRINKALAPADU VILLAGE, JEELUGUMILLI MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT.
14. JAGIDI VENKATESH S/o. LACHHAIAH, AGED 33 YEARS, R/o. D.No.5-80, KONDAPALLI VILLAGE, KUKUNOOR MANDA ELURU DISTRICT.
15. KOVVASU RAJENDRA PRASAD S/o. K KRISHNA MURTHY, AGED 29 YEARS, R/o. ANTHARVEDIGUDEM VILLAGE, BUTTAYAGUDEM MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT

16. CHIRRI SURENDRA KUMAR S/o. PARAMESWARA RAO, AGED 34 YEARS, R/o. D.No.2-20, MAIN ROAD, BARINKALAPADU VILLAGE, JEELUGUMILLI MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT.
17. BUDDULA PRASAD S/o. LAKSHMUDU, AGED 37 YEARS, R/o. D.No.13-19, VEERANNAPALEM, BUTTAYAGUDEM VILLAGE AND MANDAL ELURU DISTRICT
18. PUNEM KRISHNA S/o. GANGARAJU, AGED 41 YEARS, R/o. KORSAVARIGUDEM VILLAGE, BUTTAYAGUDEM MANDAL, ELURU DISTRICT.
19. BOTTADA RAVI BABU S/o. B NEELAKANTU, AGED 38 YEARS, R/o. GUMMALAKSHMIPURAM, VIZIANAGARAM DISTRICT.
20. TOYAKA DAMODARA S/o. LATE DALIMMA, AGED 54 YEARS, R/o. SAVARAKOTAPADU, VILLAGE, GUMMALAKSHMIPURAM MANDAL, PARVATHIPURAM MANYAM DISTRICT.
21. VATAKA KAVYA W/o VENKATA RAO, AGED 24 YEARS, R/o. DONUBAI VILLAGE, SEETHAMPETA MANDAL, PARVATHIPURAM MANYAM DISTRICT.
22. ANNAPURNA KONDAGORRI W/o. KURMAYYA, AGED 38 YEARS, R/o. HADDUBHANGI VILLAGE, SEETHAMPETA MANDAL, PARVATHIPURAM MANYAM DISTRICT.
23. CHODI SATYANARAYANA S/o. APPARAO, AGED 50 YEARS, R/o. D.NO.4-38, NELLIMETLA COLONY, RAMALAYAM, RAJAVOMMANGI, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
24. KONTELI MOHAN RAO S/o. K APPALANAIDU, AGED 39 YEARS, R/o. KINNAMGUDA, GATTUM POST, KITHALANGI MANDAL, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
25. CHALLANGI VARA PRASAD S/o. C KRISHNA RAO, AGED 39 YEARS, R/o. KOTHAVEEDHI, VANCHULAGUDEM, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT
26. MAJJI DOMBU S/o. SOMU, AGED 70 YEARS, R/o. MAJJI VALASA, ARAKU, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT
27. VANTHALA VINOD S/o. V MALKI, AGED 27 YEARS, R/o. D.No.15-26, SAGAM VALASA, SUNKARAMETTA, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.

28. MARUGODI CHIRANJEEVI S/o. CHINNA GANGARAJU, AGED 38 YEARS, R/o. LAMMASINGI, CHINTAPALLI MANDAL, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
29. KORRA SRIRAMULU S/o. CHINNALAH, AGED 33 YEARS, R/o. D.No.2-71, MARADHAGUDA, ANANTHAGIRI MANDAL, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT
30. KILLO PURUSHOTHAM S/o. K DOMBU, AGED 54 YEARS, R/o. D.No.9-96, SONAYI STREET, CHINTAPALLI VILLAGE, ALLURI SITHARAMARAJU DISTRICT.
31. BORIBORI SATYANARAYANA S/o. BASHA, AGED 34 YEARS, R/o.D.No.1-166, B COLONY, ARAKU VALLEY, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
32. GEMMELLI SUBHASH S/o. GASI, AGED 41 YEARS, R/o. D.No.14-43, KADUTHULA, PANASAPUTTU, PENASAPUT, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
33. NESAM RAMAKRISHNA S/o. BABURAO, AGED 53 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-80, AMINABAD COLONY, RAJAVOMMANGI MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
34. KORRA SHIVANAGESH S/o. K NEELAKANTAM, AGED 25 YEARS, R/o. VARRA VILLAGE, ARAKU VALLEY MANDAL, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
35. VANTHALA CHINNAMNAIDU S/o. LATE V SEETHANNA, AGED 35 YEARS, R/o. D.NO.C-29, ARAKU MAIN ROAD, NEAR ZPH SCHOOL, DUMBRIGUDA MANDAL, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
36. GANJAI PRAMILA W/o. NUKARAJU, AGED 32 YEARS, R/o. ONTIPAKA, KINCHUMANDA, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
37. KOSURI CHINNABBAYI S/o. CHANTABBAYI, AGED 31 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-151, VANCHANGI PANCHAYAT, RAJAVOMMANGI MANDAL EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
38. KANKIPATI SAI VARA VENKAT MAHESH, S/o. K.KOTHANNAPADAL, AGED 23 YEARS, R/o. D.NO.1-43, LAKKAVARAPUPETA, GK VEEDHI MANDAL, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.

39. KANKIPATI VEERANDRA PRASAD S/o. K KOTHANNAPADAL, AGED 37 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-43, LAKKAVARAPUPETA, GK VEEDHI MANDAL, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
40. URUGONDA PRASAD S/o. U LAXMAYYA, AGED 32 YEARS, R/O. D.No.3-50, CHEEDIMETTA VILLAGE, PADERU MANDAL, ALLURI SITHARAMARAJU DISTRICT
41. GORLE VENKATA GARI PRASANTH S/o. G RAJU, AGED 31 YEARS, R/O. D.No.7, JARRELLA, GUDEMKOTHA VEEDHI, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
42. KADULLA GANGADHAR S/o. RAJU, AGED 41 YEARS, R/O. D.NO.56, CHOWDUPALLE, CHINTAPALI, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
43. PANGI RAJESWARI D/o LAKSHMANA, AGED 37 YEARS, R/O. GUJJUMANIPAKKALU, KRISHNADEVIPETA, KONDAGOKIRA, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.
44. CHEDALA SRINIVASU REDDY S/o. GANGI REDDY, AGED 41 YEARS, R/o. D.No.2-36, GANGAMPALEM, DEVIPATNAM MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
45. KURSAM RAMALAKSHMI W/o. PENTAIAH, AGED 35 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-18, TULUGONDA VILLAGE, CHINTURU MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
46. KURSAM POTHURAJU S/o. GANGANNA DORA, AGED 34 YEARS, R/O. D.No.3-14, PENIKILAPADU, DEVIPATNAM MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT
47. PALLALA SEKHARA REDDY S/o. P ABBAI REDDY, AGED 36 YEARS, R/o. D.No.2-22, NULAKAMIDDI ROAD, YARLAGADDA PANCHAYAT, KOMARAVARAM MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
48. PADDAM VENU S/o. P SRI RAMULU, AGED 28 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-4, GATTUGUDEM VILLAGE, KANNAIGUDEM PANCHAYAT, YATAPAKA MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
49. KOMARAM RAVI TEJA S/o. K KRISHNA, AGED 28 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-7, COMMUNITY HALL CENTER, DEVARAM VILLAGE, DEVIPATNAM MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.

50. PEETA RAJASEKHAR S/o. P VISWANADHAM, AGED 34 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-17/A, MADHYA VEEDHI, BAYYANAPALLEM, NELLIPUDI, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
51. KAKA SUDHAKAR S/o. JOGARAO, AGED 38 YEARS, R/o. D.No.2-91, NELLIPAKA, YATAPAKA, MURUMURU, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
52. PENUBALLI NAKSHATRA W/o. TIRUPATHI RAO, AGED 38 YEARS, R/o. D.No.B1-148, KANNAIGUDEM VILLAGE, YATAPAKA MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
53. MELIGA MAHESWAR RAO S/o. M MALLURU, AGED 35 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-28, YANAMBAILU, PALVANCHA MANDAL, BHADRADI KOTHAGUDEM DISTRICT, TELANGANA STATE.
54. SEESAM VENKATESH S/o. S ADHAIAH, AGED 35 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-62, BOJJIGUPPA VILLAGE, YATAPAKA MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
55. PUNEM RAMU S/o. P RAJAIAH, AGED 35 YEARS, R/o. D.No.2-17, KUYUGURU VILLAGE, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT
56. BOKILI KANNARAO S/o. SIRAMAIAH, AGED 32 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-27, CHIDUMURUM, KHAMMAM DISTRICT, TELANGANA STATE.
57. PANDI NARESH S/o. PULLAIAH, AGED 35 YEARS, R/o. D.No.10-80/E/A/1, SANTHA BAZAR, WYRA, KHAMMAM DISTRICT, TELANGANA STATE
58. PENUBALI CHANDRAMOHAN S/o. LATE P BHADRAIAH, AGED 45 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-32, KANNAIGUDEM VILLAGE, YATAPAKA MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
59. MADIYAM RAVI S/o. MALLESH, AGED 28 YEARS, R/o. D.No.3-29, LAKKAVARAM VILLAGE, CHINTURU MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.
60. BODDA RAMESH S/o. LAKSHMAIAH, AGED 37 YEARS, R/o. D.No.1-22, RAMAVARAM, CHOPALLE, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT. RESPONDENT NOS 11 TO 60 ARE IMPEADED AS PER THE COURT'S ORDER DT.20.03.2025 IN I.A.NO.01 OF 2024.

...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 issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus, declare the action of Respondent No 4 to 10 in allotting liquor shops in Agency 5th Scheduled Areas by Drawl of Lots without obtaining prior permission of concerned Grama Sabha is bad, arbitrary, illegal, un constitutional, clear violation of Constitution of India, and set-aside G.O.Ms.No. 211, Revenue (Excise), Dt. 30 September, 2024 to the extent of its application/implementation in Agency 5th Schedule Areas and consequently direct the Respondents not to implement its Excise policy in the Agency 5th Scheduled area without obtaining prior permission of the concerned Grama Sabha and pass such other order or orders.

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

- 1.SRIMAN

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

- 1.GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV
- 2.GP FOR PROHIBITION EXCISE
- 3.GP FOR REVENUE
- 4.GINJUPALLI SUBBA RAO
- 5.GP FOR SOCIAL WELFARE

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The present Writ Petition is filed aggrieved by the action of the respondent No.1 in issuing G.O.Ms.No.211, dated 30.09.2024, Revenue (Excise) Department, for allotment of liquor shops in the State of Andhra Pradesh and implementing the said G.O. to the agency 5th scheduled areas, without obtaining prior resolution of the Grama Sabha as contemplated by the Panchayats Extension to Scheduled Areas Act, 1996 and Rules, 2011 on the ground that the said act of the respondent No.1 is bad, arbitrary, illegal, unconstitutional and clear violation of Article 244(1) r/w fifth Schedule to the Constitution of India and Panchayat Extension to Scheduled Areas Act, 1996 and Rules 2011 (hereinafter called PESA Rules, 2011).

2. It is narrated in the affidavit that the Government has invited private persons/ entities to make applications for grant of privilege for selling of IMFL and FL by shops and the selection process for grant of privilege to the shop shall be by Drawl of Lots and the G.O.Ms.No.211 is silent about the implementation of agency scheduled areas. And the said allotment of shops by drawl is contrary to the PESA Rules, 2011.

3. It is gainful to extract the relevant PESA Rule for effective disposal of the Writ Petition, is hereby extracted:

8. Powers and functions of Gram Panchayats and Mandal Parishads

- (a) The Department concerned shall inform its intention to establish a unit for manufacturing liquor in a village to the Gram Sabha concerned for its opinion on the production or manufacture of liquor in the said village. Gram Sabha will convey its opinion in the form of a resolution within four weeks. Based on the resolution of the Gram Sabha the department concerned shall act upon about the production/ manufacture of liquor in the village under intimation to Gram Sabha concerned.
- (b) The Gram Sabha shall be consulted before the grant of any license to open liquor shop in the village. Gram Sabha will convey its opinion in the form of resolution within four weeks. The license shall be granted to local scheduled tribe only.
- (c) The Department concerned shall issue a speaking order for granting or not granting any license to open liquor shop/bar in the village under intimation to the Gram Sabha concerned. The Gram Sabha resolution shall be binding and final.
- (d) The Gram Sabha shall determine the quantity of traditional liquor that may be brewed/ produced by the Scheduled Tribes living in a village for their consumption but not for sale having regard to the traditions, customs relating to consumption of local liquor during marriage and other social and religious ceremonies and their cultural identity.

4. It is further stated that the petitioners made representations to the respondents to follow PESA Rules, 2011, before allotting shops on drawl to the respective stakeholders, but they have not followed the same. Hence, the present Writ Petition is filed to direct the respondents to obtain prior permission of the concerned Grama Sabha before allotting shops on drawls.

5. Pending disposal of the Writ Petition, the unofficial respondents and stakeholders have filed I.A. No.1 of 2024 to bring them as party respondents to the Writ Petition for effective disposal of the Writ Petition. The said I.A. was allowed vide order dated 20.03.2025 and unofficial respondents are brought on record.

6. The official respondent Nos.8 and 10 have filed their counter affidavit denying all the averments made in the Writ Petition. At the outset, it is stated that no legal or fundamental right of the Writ Petitioners herein have been violated by the allotment of the A4 licenses to the unofficial respondents and the shops were disposed of only proposals by allotting to the ST candidates conducted on 14.10.2024 and no private persons have been allotted the shops in the fifth scheduled agency area and relied on the judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Ayaaubkhan Noorkhan Pathan v. State of***

Maharashtra¹ for the proposition that a stranger cannot be permitted to meddle in any legal proceeding unless he satisfies the authority or Court, that he falls within the category of an aggrieved persons. The petitioners herein have not suffered any legal injury by the action of the official respondents. Since, they are not the applicants for the allotment of the A4 shops in the scheduled areas of Eluru, Parvathipuram, Manyam and Alluri Sitharama Raju Districts of the State of Andhra Pradesh.

7. And it is further stated that it is not the case of the petitioners that they are the unsuccessful applicants for A4 shops. They do not even have a ground of any prejudice having been caused to them by the allotment of A4 shops to the unofficial respondents herein. And the petitioners have no enforceable right judicially recognized and they do not claim any prejudice having been caused to them. Only a person who has suffered from legal injury can challenge the act/action/order etc., in a Court of law.

8. A writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is maintainable either for the purpose of enforcing a statutory or legal right, or when there is a complaint that there has been a breach of statutory duty on the part of the authorities. Wherefore, petitioners must possess a judicially enforceable right available for enforcement,

¹ (2013) 4 SCC 465

on the basis of which writ jurisdiction is resorted to. The Court can, of course, enforce the performance of a statutory duty by a public body, using its writ jurisdiction at the behest of a person, provided that such person satisfies the Court that he has a legal right to insist on such performance. The 'legal right' means an entitlement arising out of legal rules. Thus, it may be defined as an advantage, or a benefit conferred upon a person by the rule of law. The expression, 'person aggrieved' does not include a person who suffers from a psychological or an imaginary injury; a person aggrieved must, therefore, necessarily be one whose right or interest has been adversely affected or jeopardized.

9. Though, it is stated in the counter affidavit, while the respondents have obtained resolution from the Grama Sabha, the same was denied by the petitioner by drawing the attention of the Court to the proceedings addressed by the Director of Tribal Welfare dated 30.03.2023. The Director of Tribal Welfare vide proceedings dated 30.03.2023 directed to conduct election to the posts of Vice President and Secretary to the villages/Grama Sabhas which are required to be held in the scheduled areas of the Districts. Admittedly, no Grama Sabha has been constituted under PESA Rules, 2011, by the date of granting licenses to sell liquor, to the un-official respondents.

10. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners relied on the order in Writ Appeal No.1506 of 2017 of the erstwhile High Court of Andhra Pradesh. In the said order dated 12.10.2017, the Division Bench of the erstwhile High Court of Andhra Pradesh, has directed the authorities concerned, pending further orders in the Writ Petition, not to grant a licence to open a bar or a liquor shop in the Scheduled Areas without a specific resolution being passed by the concerned Grama Sabha. The said order specifies that permission of Grama Sabha on PESA Rules, 2011, is essential. Placing reliance on above said order, it is emphasized that a resolution is mandatory by the Grama Sabha under the PESA Rules, 2011, for allotment of the shops to sell liquor in the scheduled areas.

11. Either, the petitioner or the respondents' counsel has not answered the Court's query as to who filed the Writ Petition, whether the 3rd party or the unsuccessful stakeholders, hence this issue is declined to rely on the order in Writ Appeal.

12. The Writ Petition is filed in the year 2023. However, this Court has not granted any interim orders suspending the G.O. impugned. The license granted to the unofficial respondents commenced from 12.10.2024, valid up to 30.09.2026. The period of license will come to end by 30.09.2026 nearly after 5 months from the date of the order.

13. As rightly argued by the learned Government Pleader for the Excise Department, the petitioners are not stakeholders as they have not participated in the draws of lots. The learned Government Pleader has relied on the following judgments in the cases of 1) **Chandra Bhushan Pandey v. Sri Narain Singh**² 2) **NHAI v. Gwalior-Jhansi Expressway Ltd.**,³ 3) **Chairman, Railway Board and others v. Chandrima Das and others**⁴ and the judgment of the Madras High Court in W.P. No.13613 of 2017 dated 26.07.2017 for the proposition that the party who has not participated in the tender cannot challenge the conditions of the tender and also relied orders of the Delhi High Court in W.P. (C) No.8220 of 2024 and CM Application No.33782 of 2024 for the proposition that a party which has not participated in a tender process does not have any locus to challenge the award of the tender and cannot be heard to make any grievances as such a party does not acquire any right in the tender.

14. The Hon'ble Apex Court had held that there is no fundamental right in dealing with the intoxicated liquor in the case of **State of Andhra Pradesh and others v. McDowell & Company and others**⁵.

15. The Writ Petition cannot be entertained for personal gain or private profit. The petitioner is really to help the needy suffering from

² 2011 SCC OnLine All 1365

³ (2018) 8 SCC 243

⁴ (2000) 2 SCC 465

⁵ (1996) 3 SCC 709

violation for their fundamental rights or of rights conferred under the statute, ought to have filed public interest litigation but not a writ petition for personal gain or for any oblique consideration. Ergo, the Writ Petition deserves rejection.

16. However, in the present case, the petitioners are not aggrieved parties. Therefore, the judgments relied by the learned Government Pleader for Excise, are squarely applicable to the present facts of the case. As the petitioners are not aggrieved parties, this Court is not inclined to direct the respondents to cancel any licence issued to the unofficial respondents. However, this Court directs that on the expiry of the A4 license, the same shall be extended only on obtaining the permission of the Grama Sabha for extension as per the PESA Rules.

17. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. However, no order as to costs.

As a sequel, interlocutory applications, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO

Date: 28.04.2026

Harin

18

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE TARLADA RAJASEKHAR RAO

W.P.No. 24922 OF 2024

Date: 28-04-2026

Harin