APHC010479542026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

Bench Sr.No:-8 [3584]

WRIT APPEAL NO: 1066 of 2026

Vutukuru Venkateswara Rao ...Appellant

Vs.

The State of Andhra Pradesh and Others ...Respondent(s)

****

CORAM : THE CHIEF JUSTICE LISA GILL

SRI JUSTICE CHALLA GUNARANJAN

DATE : 11th September 2026

Present:

Advocate for Appellant:	D V SASIDHAR, rep. by Sri V.VENUGOPAL RAO, Senior Counsel
Advocate(s) for Respondent(s):	SATEESH KUMAR EERLA, rep. by O.MANOHAR REDDY, Senior Counsel, GP FOR ENDOWMENTS

JUDGMENT: (per Hon'ble Sri Justice Challa Gunaranjan)

Appellant/writ petitioner preferred present appeal challenging the interlocutory order dated 08.09.2026 in W.P. No.18360 of 2026, by which learned Single Judge modified the interim order dated 08.07.2026. The appellant preferred writ

petition questioning the inaction of respondents 1 to 4 in appointing Executive Officer to the 6th respondent institution and protecting its properties, as described in the main prayer, and also the high-handed action of 7th respondent in trying to dispossess appellant from land measuring Ac.4.00 cents situated in Survey No.516/2A, Dargamitta, Nellore, besides proposing demolition of the existing structures thereon.

2. The appellant also filed two interlocutory applications, one directing respondents not to interfere with peaceful possession and enjoyment of the aforesaid extent of land and not to demolish the structures thereon without following due process of law; the second was filed seeking direction to respondents 1 to 4 to consider appellant's representation dated 11.06.2026 in taking steps for appointment of Executive Officer to 6th respondent institution.

3. The learned Single Judge, while issuing notice in the writ petition, vide order dated 08.07.2026, directed 2nd respondent to consider the representation of the appellant and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law within a period of three weeks and meanwhile, respondents were directed to maintain status quo as on that day. The matter was directed to be listed on 5.8.2026. Further, when the writ petition was listed on 12.08.2026, when it

was brought to the notice of Writ Court that 2nd respondent was yet to dispose the representation, was further directed to hear even unofficial respondents before passing any orders in pursuance to the representation of the appellant. The unofficial respondents entered appearance in the writ petition. The writ petition was again listed on 08.09.2026. After hearing learned counsel appearing for all the parties, learned Single Judge, by impugned order, modified the interim directions, which read as under:

> "The 2nd respondent is directed to pass appropriate orders on the representation dated 11.06.2026 within one week from today and the status quo dated 08.07.2026 is not connected from the main prayer and there are no pleadings in the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition to substantiate it and the simple prayer in the writ petition is only for disposal of the representation.
>
> Therefore, the status quo granted earlier is hereby vacated."

4. (a) Mr.V.Venugopal Rao, learned Senior Counsel, appearing for the appellant, submitted that the impugned order was passed on erroneous assumption that there was no pleading either in the affidavit or in the main prayer with regard to the proposed action of dispossession and demolition of structures, therefore, the

order of learned Single Judge to the extent of vacating the status quo as granted earlier is unsustainable.

(b) It is also submitted that 2nd respondent has already concluded the hearing on 01.09.2026 and that orders are expected to be issued soon, therefore, he urged that protection be granted to the appellant by directing the respondents to maintain status quo.

5. *(a) Per contra*, Sri O.Manohar Reddy, learned Senior Counsel, appearing for respondents 6 and 7, contended that the very writ petition itself is not maintainable, inasmuch as respondents 6 and 7, being private institutions, are not governed by the provisions of Endowments Act, therefore, 2nd respondent is incompetent to decide the disputes between the parties.

(b) He further submitted that the appellant, having given an undertaking confirming that he has already vacated the subject premises and that even the material lying there would be cleared by 30.08.2026, has come up with present writ petition by trying to rope in official respondents, which cannot be countenanced.

6. We have considered the submissions of learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

7. Perusal of the pleadings in the writ petition clearly suggests that appellant not only averred that respondents 6 and 7 were trying to dispossess and demolish the structures forcibly, but also made specific prayer seeking protection. The learned Single Judge was probably not drawn attention to the aforesaid aspects, thus, leading to the passing of the impugned order. Sri O.Manohar Reddy, learned Senior Counsel for contesting respondents, could not deny the factum of aforesaid pleadings in the affidavit filed in support of writ petition.

8. Though both learned Senior Counsel tried to argue on the merits of the matter, we are not inclined to go into those specific details, inasmuch as, the writ petition is stated to be listed again on 18.09.2026 for further consideration. We are also informed that even 2nd respondent concluded the hearing on 01.09.2026 and is likely to pass orders soon. We, therefore, expect that 2nd respondent would pass appropriate orders well before the next date of hearing. We, therefore, dispose of the appeal by directing the respondents to maintain status quo till the matter is listed again before the learned Single Judge.

9. Accordingly, with the above direction, this writ appeal stands disposed of. No costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending consideration, if any, in this case shall stand closed.

LISA GILL, CJ **CHALLA GUNARANJAN, J**

SS