

APHC010588612025



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

[3209]

WEDNESDAY, THE ELEVENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

WRIT PETITION Nos: 30552, 30612 and 32048 of 2025

Between:

1. PERUMAL DILLIBABU REDDY, S/o. VENKATA CHALAPATHI REDDY,
AGE 61 YEARS, OCC- JOURNALIST, R/O.20-4-34/G3,
JAYALAKSHMI STREET, KOTTAPALLI, TIRUPATI TOWN, TIRUPATI
URBAN MANDAL, TIRUPATI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH-517501

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, PANCHAYAT RAJ AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR DISTRICT,
ANDHRA PRADESH

2. THE COMMISSIONER-CUM-DIRECTOR, STATE OF ANDHRA
PRADESH, PANCHAYAT RAJ AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
DEPARTMENT, PVS ICON, TADEPALLI, GUNTUR DISTRICT,
ANDHRA PRADESH-522501.

3. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR KONASEEMA
DISTRICT AT AMALAPURAM, ANDHRA PRADESH-533201.

4. THE DISTRICT REVENUE AND FIRST APPELLATE OFFICER,
UNDER RIGHT TO INFORMATION ACT, DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR
KONASEEMA DISTRICT, AMALAPURAM, ANDHRA PRADESH-
533201.

5. THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, KAKINADA ZILLA PRAJA
PARISHAD, KAKINADA, KAKINADA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH-
533001.

6.THE MANDAL PRAJA PARISHAD DEVELOPMENT OFFICER
CUMFIRST APPELLATE AUTHORITY, C/O. THE MANDAL PRAJA
PARISHAD DEVELOPMENT, RAJOLE MANDAL, DR. B.R.
AMBEDKAR KONASEEMA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH-533242.

7.THE PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICERCUMPANCHAYAT RAJ
EXTENSION OFFICER CUMDEPUTY MANDAL PRAJA PARISHA,
C/O. THE MANDAL PRAJA PARISHAD DEVELOPMENT, RAJOLE
MANDAL, DR. B.R. AMBEDKAR KONASEEMA DISTRICT, ANDHRA
PRADESH-533242.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.Mr.PEETA RAMAN

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

2.GP FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following Common Order:

The petitioner, who claims to be a journalist, filed these writ petitions seeking to declare the action of the 7th respondent in not providing the information sought for under the provisions of the Right to Information Act and inaction against the 7th respondents by the respondents 3, 4 and 6, pursuant to the complaints made by the petitioner, as illegal, arbitrary etc., and for consequential directions.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia* submits that the petitioner made applications seeking certain information under the Right to Information Act (for short 'the Act') and as the 7th respondent failed to furnish the same, First Appeal is preferred before the 6th respondent. He further submits that the 6th respondent instead of taking necessary action / appreciating the appeal preferred by the petitioner, surprisingly issued a notice calling upon the petitioner to attend the office of the First Appellate Authority, which is not contemplated under the provisions of the Act. Be that as it may. He submits that as the Appellate Authority has not taken any action with regard to furnishing of information as sought for, the petitioner is constrained to file the present writ petitions. He also sought to impress upon the Court that though there is a provision for Second Appeal under the Right to Information Act, the same is not a bar for filing of writ petition, more particularly in the facts and circumstances of the case, which are set out in the affidavits filed in support of the writ petitions.

3. Mr.Y.Koteswara Rao, the learned counsel for the respondents 5 to 7, on the other hand, on the basis of the instructions made submissions. He submits that when a notice was issued by the First Appellate Authority, the petitioner ought to have attended the office for necessary clarification. He also submits that if the petitioner has any grievance with regard to non-disposal of the First Appeal, the petitioner has a remedy under the provisions of the Act. He, further, submits that so far as the First Appeal filed by the petitioner is concerned, the same is pending.

4. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel on both sides, this Court instead of examining the matter by inviting counters of the concerned respondents, deems it appropriate to direct the first respondent to dispose of the Appeals filed by the petitioner by fixing a time limit. The learned counsel for the petitioner fairly agreed for the same.

5. Therefore, without going into merits or otherwise of the case, the writ petitions are disposed of, providing that the First Appellate Authority i.e., the Mandal Praja Parishad Development Officer shall pass appropriate orders on the appeals preferred by the petitioner, strictly in accordance with the Law, as expeditiously as possible, within a period of four (4) weeks from today. No costs. Consequently, all pending applications shall stand closed.

JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

Dt. 11.02.2026

Note: Furnish C.C. in 7 days.

B/o.

BLV

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

WRIT PETITION Nos: 30552, 30612 and 32048 of 2025

Date: 11.02.2026

BLV