APHC010094932018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3333]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE 7th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

WRIT PETITION NO: 4152/2018

Between:

1. GUDE NAGARAJU,, S/O. CHINA PERAIAH AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, OCC SOCIAL ACTIVIST R/O. D.NO. 2-1-291/11, OPP. GANDHI BOMMA GADDALAGUNTA, ONGOLE, PRAKASAM DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. ANDHRA PRADESH INFORMATION COMMISSION, MANGALAGIRI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
3. THE APPELLATE AUTHORITY CUM MPDO, MPDO OFFICE, PONNALURU, PRAKASAM DISTRICT.
4. THE PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER, MPDO OFFICE, PONNALURU MANDAL, PRAKASAM DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT(S):

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 toto issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ or direction declaring (i) the action of the4th respondent / Public Information Officer (PIO) in not furnishing the information requested under Right to Information Act, 2005 vide application dated 05.05.2017 submitted by the petitioner (ii) the action of the 2nd and 3rd respondents / appellate authorities in not acting on the appeals filed against the PIO's inaction in disposing of the

application for information and (iii) the action of the 1st respondent / State in not appointing State Information Commissioners as illegal, arbitrary, unjust, unconstitutional and against the spirit of the Right to Information Act, 2005 and consequently direct the 4th respondent to furnish the information, direct the 1st respondent to fill up the posts of Information Commissioners in the 2nd respondent Institution and direct the 2nd respondent to dispose of the appeal filed by the petitioner and take action against the 4th respondent for not furnishing the information and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2018

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 4th respondent to forthwith furnish the information on the application dated 05-05-2017 submitted by the petitioner under RTI Act Pending disposal of the Writ Petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. SYED ARIF BASHA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (AP)
2. G SESHADRI(SC FOR MPP ZPP)
3. G P FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AP

The Court made the following

ORDER:

The present Writ Petition came to be filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following relief:-

> *"… to issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ or direction declaring (i) the action of the 4th respondent / Public Information Officer (PIO) in not furnishing the information requested under Right to Information Act, 2005 vide application dated 05.05.2017 submitted by the petitioner (ii) the action of the 2nd and 3rd respondents / appellate authorities in not acting on the appeals filed against the PIO's inaction in disposing of the application for information and (iii) the action of the 1st respondent / State in not appointing State Information Commissioners as illegal, arbitrary, unjust, unconstitutional and against the spirit of the Right to Information Act, 2005 and consequently direct the 4th respondent to furnish the information, direct the 1st respondent to fill up the posts of Information Commissioners in the 2nd respondent Institution and direct the 2nd respondent to dispose of the appeal filed by the petitioner and take action against the 4th respondent for not furnishing the information…."*

2. Today, when the matter came up for hearing, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.3 and 4 has furnished a copy of the instructions of respondent No.4/Public Information Officer, Mandal Praja Parishad, Ponnuluru Mandal, wherein it is stated that the information sought by the petitioner was duly furnished by the then Public Information Officer in accordance with the provisions of the Right to Information Act, 2005. After furnishing the requisite information, the said RTI application was duly disposed of, and a communication to that effect was sent to the petitioner on

29.03.2017, as evidenced by the relevant records pertaining to Register-I of the Mandal Praja Parishad, Ponnaluru, maintained by their office. In support of the said contention, respondent No.4 has also filed a copy of the endorsement to establish that the same was sent to the petitioner on 29.03.2017.

3. Recording the above instructions and as the information sought by the petitioner has already been furnished by the concerned Public Information Officer, no further cause survives in the present Writ Petition.

4. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, Interlocutory Applications pending, if any, in this Writ Petition, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

Date: 07.10.2026
KGR/GSN