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

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

WP(PIL) NO: 22 OF 2025

Between:

Mallavarapu Lakshmana Kumar, S/o. Rama Krishnaiah, Aged 65 years Occ: Self-Employee, R/o. FL. No. 503 Krishna Residency Pingali Venkaiah Street Ramavarapadu Vijayawada Krishna Adhaar No. 766171938156 Bank Account No. 20172929821, State Bank of India, Ramavarapadu

... PETITIONER-

AND

1. Union of India, Ministry of Home Affairs Rep. Its Home Secretary, North block. New Delhi 110001.
2. Union of India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Rep. by Its Secretary, Room no.655, A Wing Shastri Bhavan, New Delhi. 110001.
3. Union of India, Ministry of Finance, Rep. by Its Secretary, Room No. 129-A, North Block, New Delhi.
4. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Chief Secretary to Government. Building1, 1st floor AP secretariat, Velagapudi Guntur.
5. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary (Home Department), Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Room No. 136, Ground Floor, Building No.2, Velagapudi, Andhra Pradesh.
6. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary (Law and Legislature), Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Velagapudi, Andhra Pradesh.
7. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary (Finance (CT)) Department, Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Velagapudi, Andhra Pradesh

8. The Andhra Pradesh State Film Television and Theatre Development Corporation, Rep. By its Managing Director NTR Administrative Block 4th Floor Pandit Nehru Bus Depot Vijayawada.

9. The Commissioner, Information and public relations department Arrival Block, Pandit Nehru Bus Station, Vijayawada.

10. The Director General of Police, Police Headquarters, Beside NH-16 Service Road, Mangalagiri Guntur.

11. The GST Council (Ministry of Finance), Rep.by its Secretary, 5th Floor, Tower II, Jeevan Bharti Building, Janpath Road, Connaught Place, New Delhi-110 001.

12. The Income Tax Department (Ministry of Finance), Rep. by its Principal Chief Commissioner of Income Tax Andhra Pradesh & Telangana Region 10th Floor. Income Tax Towers, AC Guards, Hyderabad - 500 004.

13. The Directorate of Enforcement, Department of Revenue Ministry of Finance Government of India Rep by its Director Pravartan Bhawan, APJ Abdul Kalam Road New Delhi-110011.

14. M/s. Sri Venkateswara Creations, Rep. By its Producer V. Venkata Ramana Reddy (Dil Raju) Plot No. 132 & 133 Kamalapuri Colony Srinagar Colony, Hyderabad, Telangana.

15. Ravipudi Anil Kumar, S/o. Brahmaiah, Aged 43 years, Occ: Director, R/o.Plot No. 132 & 133 Kamalapuri Colony Srinagar Colony, Hyderabad, Telangana.

16. Daggubati Venkatesh, S/o. Ramanaidu Aged 64 years, Occ: Actor / Hero, R/o. Plot No. 132 & 133 Kamalapuri Colony Srinagar Colony, Hyderabad, Telangana.

17. Kum Meenakshi Chaudhary, D/o. B.R Chaudhary Aged 27 years, Occ: Actress / Heroine, R/o. Plot No. 132 & 133 Kamalapuri Colony Srinagar Colony, Hyderabad, Telangana.

18. Kum Aishwarya Rajesh, D/o. Late Rajesh Aged 35 years, Occ: Actress / Heroine, R/o. Plot No. 132 & 133 Kamalapuri Colony Srinagar Colony, Hyderabad, Telangana.

19. Daggubati Suresh Babu, S/o. Ramanaidu Aged 66 years, Occ: Producer /Distributor, R/o. Rama Naidu Studios Film Nagar, Telangana Hyderabad -500 033.

... RESPONDENTS

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 an order, writ or direction, more particularly one in the nature of WRIT OF MANDAMUS declaring the action of the respondents enhancing the ticketing price and telecast of number of shows per day of 14 to 18th respondent Super High Budget Films Sankranthiki Vasthunam violating the orders of this court in WP.No.7094 of 2022 dated 20.04.2022 and quidproquo of production cost of more than Rs.100 crores is illegal, arbitrary, unjust, improper against principles of Natural Justice and (i) Direct the respondents more particularly 5th respondent to revise the ticket price of 14 to 18th respondent Super High Budget Films Sankranthiki Vasthunam as per G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022 and recover the excess amounts to state exchequer (ii) Direct the 13th respondent to make a proper inquiry / investigation against 14 to 18th respondents Super High Budget Films Sankranthiki Vasthunam of quidproquo of production cost of more than Rs.100 crores (iii) Direct the respondents to import a proper inquiry against 14 to 19th respondents for their hype in promoting their film named Sankranthiki Vasthunam.

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the respondents more particularly 13th respondent to make a proper inquiry / investigation against 14 to 18th respondents Super High Budget Films ""Sankranthiki Vasthunam" of quidproquo of production cost of more than Rs.IOO crores for enhancing the ticket price and telecast of number of shows per day for 14 to 18th respondent movie Sankranthiki Vasthunam as per G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated

07.03.2022 inorder to deposit excess amount to state exchequer pending disposal of the above writ petition in the interest of justice.

Counsel for the Petitioner : SRI GUNDALA SIVA PRASADA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 3 : SRI P. PONNA RAO, DEPUTY SOLICITOR GENERAL OF INDIA

Counsel for the Respondent No.4 : GP FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.5 & 10 : GP FOR HOME

Counsel for the Respondent No.6 :GP FOR LAW AND LEGISLATURE

Counsel for the Respondent No.7 : GP FOR COMMERCIAL TAX

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.8, 9, 14 to 19 : NONE APPEARED

Counsel for the Respondent No.11 : Mrs. SANTIPRIYA, CENTRAL GOVT. COUNSEL

Counsel for the Respondent No.12 : SRI Y.N. VIVEKANANDA, CENTRAL GOVT. COUNSEL

Counsel for the Respondent No.13 :SRI J. BHASKAR, SC FOR CENTRAL GOVT. COUNSEL

Counsel for the Respondents : Ms. S. PRANTHI, SPECIAL GOVERNMENT PLEADER

The Court made the following: ORDER

APHC010038742025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3483]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WP(PIL) NO: 22/2025

Between:

Mallavarapu Lakshmana Kumar ...**PETITIONER**

AND

Union Of India and Others ...**RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. GUNDALA SIVA PRASADA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR HOME
2. GP FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
3. GP FOR COMMERCIAL TAX
4.
5. GP FOR LAW LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

CORAM: THE CHIEF JUSTICE DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR
SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

DATE: 26.03.2025

ORDER: (Per Sri Justice Ravi Cheemalapati)

This writ petition in the nature of the Public Interest Litigation has been filed for following relief:

"...declaring the action of the respondents enhancing the ticketing price and telecast of number of shows per day of 14 to 18th respondent Super High Budget Films "Sankranthiki Vasthunam" violating the orders of this court in W.P.No.7094 of 2022 dated 20.04.2022 and quidproquo of production cost of more than Rs.100 crores is illegal, arbitrary, unjust, improper against principles of Natural Justice and (i) Direct the respondents more particularly 5th respondent to revise the ticket price of

14th to 18th respondent Super High Budget Films "Sankranthiki Vasthunam" as per G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022 and recover the excess amounts to state exchequer (ii) Direct the 13th respondent to make a proper inquiry/investigation against 14 to 18th respondents Super High Budget Films "Sankranthiki Vasthunam" of quidproquo of production cost of more than Rs.100 crores (iii) Direct the respondents to import a proper inquiry against 14 to 19th respondents for their hype in promoting their film named "Sankranthiki Vasthunam" and pass.."

2. Heard Sri G.Siva Prasad Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms S.Pranathi, learned Special Government Pleader for Respondents.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner in elaboration to what has been stated in the affidavit, would contend that, the respondents have issued a memo dated 08.01.2025 for enhancing the ticket rates of the movie/film named "Sankranthiki Vasthunam" and further given permission to screen six(06) shows on 14.01.2025 and to screen five(05) shows from 15.01.2025 to 23.01.2025 with an additional amount of Rs.125/- (including GST) for Multiplex and Rs.100/- (including GST) for single theatres on the existing (prevailing) rates, contrary to G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022. He would further contend that, in G.O.Ms.No.13 dated 07.03.2022, at para 3, for Rates of Admission into theatres wherein a fixed rate per show was issued in different areas with different nature of theatres but in the memo issued by the 5th respondent, there was no specific rate for each category of show and altogether a fixed rate was confined which violates the said G.O. In fact, this Court in W.P.No.7094 of 2022, granted interim stay for implementation of the G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022 and the same is still in force. In such an event, issuance of the

memo dated 08.01.2025 by the 5th respondent, whereby enhancing the ticket prices is illegal, unsustainable and would curtail the rights guaranteed under the Constitution.

4. On the other hand, Ms S.Pranathi, Special Government Pleader for Respondents submitted that the Government is proposing to modify the G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022 and the same is under consideration. She further contended that, in fact, the said G.O. was questioned by one Multiplex Association of India Federation House in W.P.No.7094 of 2022, which is pending adjudication before this Court. Further, the petitioner has not made out any case in the present Public Interest Litigation (PIL) and the same is filed for oblique motives and for oblique consideration and the same deserves dismissal.

5. It is evident that questioning the G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022, a writ petition vide W.P.No.7094 of 2022 was filed before this Court, which is pending adjudication wherein an interim stay was granted by this Court and the same is still in force. In spite of the said interim stay, the respondents have enhanced the ticket prices for the film named "Sankranthiki Vastunam" by issuing a memo dated 08.01.2025, is the stand of the petitioner in the present PIL. As it could be seen, the interim stay order passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.7094 of 2022 is with regard to online service charges, which is not the issue in the case on hand.

6. Further, in the memo issued by the 5th respondent dated 08.01.2025, the six(06) shows were scheduled on 14.01.2025 and five(05) shows were scheduled from 15.01.2025 to 23.01.2025. By the time this point fell for consideration, the said shows have already been telecast, which serves no purpose in dealing with the said aspect. Moreover, in view of the stand taken by the Government that they are proposing to modify the G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022, this Court is of the opinion that this petition has been, in fact, filed not on account of the interest of the public but only for purposes of getting publicity.

7. In so far as the investigation with regard to production cost of the movie/film is concerned, it is not viable in the writ Court to order the initiation of an investigation. That function clearly lies in the domain of the executive and it is up to the investigating agencies themselves to decide whether the material produced before them provides a sufficient basis to launch an investigation. In the said circumstances, directing the Enforcement Directorate to investigate, in our view, is again a abuse of the process of the Court, as the petition is short of wild and sweeping allegations and there is nothing placed before the Court which in any way may be called to be prima facie evidence. The petitioner, thus, is attempting to seek a roving probe monitored by this Court into suspicions so entertained by the petitioners based on nothing but bald allegations. This is thus, certainly not a case warranting the exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution.

8. Be that as it may, considering the fact that there is no point in dealing with the aspect of enhancing the ticket prices for the film named "Sankranthiki Vastunam", as the scheduled shows have already been telecast, this Public Interest Litigation (PIL) is liable to be dismissed.

Accordingly, the Public Interest Litigation is ***dismissed***. There shall be no orders as to costs.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

Sd/- M.RAMESH BABU
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. One CC to Sri Gundala Siva Prasada Reddy, Advocate [OPUC]
2. Two CCs to Ms. S. Pranathi, Special Government Pleader, High Court of Andhra Pradesh. (OUT)
3. One CC to Sri P. Ponna Rao, Deputy Solicitor General of India Advocate [OPUC]
4. Two CC to GP for General Administration, High Court of Andhra Pradesh. (OUT)
5. Two CC to GP for Commercial Tax, High Court of Andhra Pradesh. (OUT)
6. Two CC to GP for Home, High Court of Andhra Pradesh. (OUT)
7. Two CC to GP for Law & Lagislature, High Court of Andhra Pradesh. (OUT)
8. One CC to Mrs. Santipriya, Central Govt. Counsel (OPUC)
9. One CC to Sri Y.N. Vivekananda, Central Govt. Counsel (OPUC)
10. One CC to Sri J. Bhaskar, Central Govt. Counsel (OPUC)
11. Three C.D. Copies.

Cnr

HIGH COURT

CNR

DATED:28/03/2025

ORDER

WP(PIL).No.22 of 2025



DISMISSING THE WP(PIL) WITHOUT COSTS