



**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: 26892/2026

Between:

C Prahlada and others

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

Union of India and others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. SESHADRI GOALLA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR LAND ACQUISITION

2.

The Court made the following order:

Learned Government Pleader for Road Transports and Highways Department takes notice on behalf of respondent No.1.

Sri Tandava Yogesh, learned standing counsel of National Highways Authority of India, takes notice on behalf of respondent No.2.

Learned Government Pleader for Land Acquisition Department takes notice on behalf of respondent Nos.3 to 5.

For counters, post on 05.10.2026 in the Motion List.

I.A No. 1 of 2026

Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that, without following the provisions of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, the respondent authorities, at the instance of the unofficial respondent, are attempting to widen the service road through the petitioners' lands admeasuring Ac.2.00 cents, Ac.1.50 cents and Ac.1.20 cents, covered by Khata Nos.913, 914 and 915, respectively, in Survey No.243-1A of Kakkalapalli Revenue Village, Anantapuram Mandal and District. If the highhanded action of the respondents is allowed to continue, the rights of the petitioners will be prejudiced. Hence, prayed to pass appropriate orders protecting the interests of the petitioners.

On the other hand, Sri Tandava Yogesh, learned Standing Counsel for NHA, while opposing the submissions of learned counsel for the petitioners, contended that the vendors of the petitioners had earlier filed a writ petition, wherein this Court did not grant any interim order. Therefore, no interim order can be passed in the present writ petition. He sought time to file counter.

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

The contention of the learned Standing Counsel that the vendors of the petitioners had earlier approached this Court and that no interim order was granted in the said writ petition, by itself, cannot be a ground to deny interim protection to the petitioners. The prayer for interim relief in the present writ petition has to be considered on its own merits, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of the grievance raised by the petitioners.

In view of the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court is of the *prima facie* view that the matter requires consideration. Since the learned

standing counsel seeks time to file counter, this Court, in the meantime, in order to meet the ends of justice, is inclined to pass the following order.

‘*Status Quo* as on today shall be maintained with regard to subject property for a period of two weeks.’

For counter, post on 28.09.2026.

RAVI CHEEMALAPATI, J

Dt: 19.09.2026

MP