



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

[3332]

SATURDAY, THE 19th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

WRIT PETITION NO: 26802/2026

Between:

Yindu Textiles Private Limited

...PETITIONER

AND

The Union of India and others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.VENKAT SAILENDRA G

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

The Court made the following order:

Smt P.Saraswathi, learned Central Government Counsel, takes notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to take out personal notice on respondent Nos.4 and 5 by registered/speed post with acknowledgment due and file proof of service in the Registry within two (2) weeks.

Post on 26.10.2026.

(contd....)

I.A No. 1 of 2026

Sri Gudapati Venkateswararao, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, submitted that respondent Nos.2 and 3 issued the Unique ID based on the proposals submitted by respondent Nos.4 and 5. In view of the generation of the Unique ID, the respondent authorities are bound to grant 2% interest reimbursement to the petitioner company under the Revised Restructured Technology Upgradation Fund Scheme (RR-TUF Scheme). He further submitted that respondent No.4 restricted the eligible loan amount to Rs.26.20 crores, out of the total loan amount of Rs.30.00 crores sanctioned by respondent No.5. On the eligible loan amount of Rs.26.20 crores, the petitioner company is entitled to 2% interest reimbursement amounting to approximately Rs.2.70 crores.

Learned counsel further submitted that respondent No.3, vide proceedings dated 31.08.2026, directed respondent Nos.4 and 5 to recover an amount of Rs.1.50 crores towards the subsidy already released in favour of the petitioner company, on the ground that the petitioner unit is a rejected case under the RR-TUF Scheme. He further submitted that the respondent authorities, while passing the impugned proceedings, relied upon the letter dated 25.06.2015 addressed by respondent No.4 to respondent No.5. He further contended that the reference to the Unique ID in the letter dated 25.06.2015 was an inadvertent mistake and the said mistake was subsequently clarified by respondent No.4 vide letter dated 04.10.2023 addressed to respondent No.2. He further contended that the petitioner company ought not to be deprived of the benefit of 2% interest reimbursement under the RR-TUF Scheme merely on account of an inadvertent error in the correspondence issued by respondent No.4. Hence, prayed to pass appropriate orders protecting the interest of the petitioner.

Perused the material available on record and considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.

A perusal of the letter dated 04.10.2023 addressed by respondent No.4 to respondent No.2 shows that it was informed therein that the wrong date had been mentioned inadvertently and that the date of generation of the Unique ID (UID) may be considered as the date of the ECN, since the original date of the ECN was not known.

Taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is of the *prima facie* view that the matter requires consideration and a detailed counter is required. In the meantime, this Court, in order to meet the ends of justice, is inclined to pass the following order as an interim measure:

“There shall be stay of all further proceedings pursuant to the proceedings issued by respondent No.3 dated 31.08.2026 pending further orders.”

RAVI CHEEMALAPATI, J

Dt: 19.09.2026

MP