Date of reserved for orders : 19.8.2026
Date of pronouncement : 12.10.2026
Date of uploading : 12.10.2026

APHC010173832026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI [3327]
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE 12th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 10010/2026

Between:

1. PLR PROJECTS PVT LTD, REPRESENTED BY ITS AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY, C. CHANDRA SEKHAR REDDY, S/O LATE VENKATA SUBBA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 57 YEARS, OCC CONTRACTOR, R/O SURVEY NO. 12 (PART). PLOT NO.2-91/12/A/AM/G-L, 5TH FLOOR, ASTRA TOWERS, KOTHAGUDA POST, KONDAPUR, HI TECH CITY, HYDERABAD

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, PANCHAYAT RAJ ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT. (522238)

2. THE PROJECT DIRECTOR, ANDHRA PRADESH RURAL ROAD PROJECT (APRRP), PR, VIJAYAWADA, KRISHNA DISTRICT.(520002)

3. THE ENGINEERINCHIEF, PR, VIJAYAWADA, BANDAR ROAD, ZP COMPOUND, VIJAYAWADA. (520002)

4. THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, PR CIRCLE, CHITTOOR DISTRICT. (517001)

5. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

UNIT (P.I.U) DIVISION, CHITTOOR, CHITTOOR DISTRICT. (517001)

6. THE DEPUTY EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION UNIT, P.R, CHOWDEPALLI, CHITTOOR DISTRICT. (517418)

7. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP., BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, FINANCE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT. (522238)

8. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL V AND E, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT, O/AT 2ND FLOOR, PANDIT NEHRU BUS STAND, VIJAYAWADA, NTR DISTRICT (520013).

9. THE REGIONAL VIGILANCE AND ENFORCEMENT OFFICER, TIRUPATI, TIRUPATI DISTRICT (517501). RR 8 AND 9 ARE IMPLEADED AS PER COURTS ORDER DT. 18.08.2026 IN I.A.NO.2 OF 2026

...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 topleased to issue a WRIT OF MANDAMUS declaring the action of the Respondents herein, in withholding the payment of Ilnd and Part Bill to an amount of Rs. 8,63,19,197/- (M-Book No 1850-A, 4387-A and 6374-B), even after finalizing the bills payable to the petitioner in relation to the Package No. 77/APRRP/PRED/ CTR/ Road 017 -Consists of 73 Road works in Chowdepalle, Pulicherla, Punganur, Rompicherla and Sodam Mandals of Punganur Constituency in Chittoor District as per the Agreement No. /2023-24, Dt.27.07.2023 is questioned, as the same is illegal, arbitrary and violative of Articles 14, 16, 19 86 300-A of Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to consider for payment of IDd and Part Bill to an amount of Rs. 8,63,19,197/- (M-Book No 1850-A, 4387-A and 6374-B), with an interest @ 24 percent per annum for the delayed amount to the

petitioner in respect of execution of above-mentioned work forthwith and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

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 pleased to DIRECT the respondents to consider for payment of ID^ and Part Bill to an amount of Rs. 8,63,19,197/- (M-Book No: 1850-A, 4387- A and 6374-B), with an interest of 24% per annum for the delayed amount to the petitioner in respect of execution of works under Package No. 77/APRRP/PRED/CTR/ Road 017 - Consists of 73 Road works in Chowdepalle, Pulicherla, Punganur, Rompicherla and Sodam Mandals of Punganur Constituency in Chittoor District as per the Agreement No. /2023-24, Dt.27.07.2023 pending disposal of the Writ Petition and pass

IA NO: 2 OF 2026

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 may be pleased to permit the Petitioner to Implead the Proposed Respondent Nos.8 and 9 as parties/Respondents in the above W.P.No. 10010 OF 2026 and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. SURESH KUMAR REDDY KALAVA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

2. GP FOR FINANCE PLANNING

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K.SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.10010 of 2026

O R D E R

This Writ Petition is filed seeking to declare the action of the respondents in withholding the payment of IInd and part bill amounting to Rs.8,63,19,197/- even after finalizing the bills payable to the petitioner in relation to the work viz. Package No.77/APRRP/PRED/CTR/Road 017-consisting of 73 road works in Chowdepalle, Pulicherla, Punganur, Rompicherla and Sodam Mandals of Punganur Constituency in Chittoor district, as per the Agreement No. /2023-24, dated 27.7.2023 (M.Book Nos.1850-A, 4387-A and 6374-B), executed by the petitioner, as illegal and arbitrary, and consequently direct the respondents to pay the said amount along with interest @ 24% per annum for the delayed period, to the petitioner for execution of the aforesaid work.

2. It is stated that administrative sanction for the subject work was accorded under G.O.Ms.No.10, PR & RD (Progs-II) Department, dated 29.03.2022 under APRRP (AIIB) grant for the subject package. Respondent No.4 awarded technical sanction therefor. Pursuant to a bid invited by respondent No.3 for the subject work, the petitioner participated in the tender process, and its tender was accepted. Respondent No.2 entered an agreement with the petitioner on 27.7.2023 and handed over the subject work on the same day.

3. It is stated that the petitioner proceeded with the work awarded to it and executed the same to the utmost satisfaction of the authorities within the time stipulated, and that the same was measured and entered in the Measurement book vide Nos.1850-A, 4387-A and 6374-B.

4. It is stated that the Quality Control authorities visited the site, inspected the work done by the petitioner and issued different Quality Control Certificates, including the one dated 11.06.2025. It is stated that being satisfied with the execution of the work, respondents, after measuring the same, entered the IInd and Part bill to an amount of Rs.8,63,19,197/- in the bills and respondent No.6 prepared the bill and submitted the same to respondent No.5 on 10.06.2025 for aduit and payment, but the same has not been passed even after lapse of two years.

5. It is the grievance of the petitioner that even though the petitioner approached the respondent authorities on multiple occasions requesting for payment of aforesaid pending bill amount, they are not paying the said amount. According to petitioner, having executed the work satisfactorily, within the prescribed time, non-payment of the bill amount is arbitrary and unjustified. It is further stated that the petitioner, being a contractor, spent huge money for executing the subject work, and the delay in payment is causing severe financial hardship, necessitating the filing of the present Writ Petition seeking appropriate directions for release of the outstanding amount.

6. The Writ Petition was filed in the month of April, 2026. As per Rule 12 (i) (a) of the Writ Proceedings Rules, 1977 of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh, *every respondent in every Writ Petition intending to enter appearance and oppose any Writ Petition on which notice is issued by the High Court, shall enter appearance and file a Counter Affidavit in opposition as soon as may be and in any event one hundred and twenty days from the date of service of notice in the Writ Petition or the Service of Rule nisi on the said Respondent*. Despite adjourning the Writ Petition from time to time for filing counter-affidavits by the respondents, the counter-affidavits have not been filed within the stipulated period of 120 days as per the Writ Proceedings Rules, 1977. The respondents-authorities also did not provide written instructions of the respective authorities.

7. During pendency of the Writ Petition, the Director General (V&E), General Administration Department and the Regional Vigilance and Enforcement Officer, Tirupati, were impleaded as respondents 8 and 9 in the Writ Petition, as per the Order of this Court dated 18.08.2026 in I.A.No.2 of 2026.

8. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Government Pleader for the Panchayat Raj and Rural Development and the learned Government Pleader for Finance and Planning.

9. The fact remains that *in spite* of granting number of adjournments and even after expiry of the time stipulated

under Rule 12 (i) (a) of the Writ Proceedings Rules, 1977 of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh, the respondent authorities neither secured written instructions nor filed counter-affidavits. Therefore, this Court is constrained to proceed with the Writ Petition basing on the material available on record.

10. A perusal of the material on record goes to show that there is no dispute with regard to the fact that the respondent-authorities assigned the subject contract work Package No.77/APRRP/PRED/CTR/Road 017-consisting of 73 road works in Chowdepalle, Pulicherla, Punganur, Rompicherla and Sodam Mandals of Punganur Constituency in Chittoor district, as per the Agreement No. /2023-24, dated 27.7.2023, to the petitioner.

11. Grievance of the petitioner is that though it executed the said contract work within the stipulated time to the satisfaction of the respondent authorities and the same was measured and entered in Measurement Book vide M.Book Nos.1850-A, 4387-A and 6374-B, and that the Quality Control authorities visited the site, inspected the work done by the petitioner and issued Quality Control Certificates stating that the work executed by the petitioner is satisfactory, the respondents are not releasing the pending IInd and Part bill to a tune of Rs.8,63,19,197/- spent by it, for executing the subject work.

12. A perusal of the material on record goes to show that Quality Control authorities inspected the work executed by the petitioner and came to the conclusion that the work executed by the petitioner is satisfactory. The respondent-authorities cannot withhold the legitimate payments due to the contractors who admittedly and genuinely executed the works entrusted to them. Once the works have been duly executed and the amounts have become payable, the respondent-authorities are under an obligation to take a decision on the claims in accordance with law. The State and its instrumentalities cannot withhold legitimate payments on extraneous considerations. Administrative inaction cannot be allowed to defeat a legitimate claim, particularly when the respondents do not dispute the execution of the works or demonstrate any lawful impediment to the release of the admitted dues.

13. In a case for a direction to pay the admitted and undisputed amount, Writ Petition is maintainable. In *M/s. Utkal Highways Engineers and Contractors v. Chief General Manager & Ors.*[1], it was held as under: (Paragraph No.8)

> "Be that as it may, the High Court has not dealt with the merits of the Writ Petition. Moreover, it is not an inviolable rule that no money claim can be adjudicated upon in exercise of Writ jurisdiction. Non-payment of admitted dues, *inter alia*, may be considered an arbitrary action on the part of

[1] 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1400.

> respondents and for claiming the same, a Writ Petition may lie. Further, throwing a Writ Petition on ground of availability of alternative remedy after 10 years, particularly, when parties have exchanged their affidavits, is not the correct course unless there are disputed questions of fact which by their very nature cannot be adjudicated upon without recording formal evidence."

14. On this aspect, it is also pertinent to refer to a decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Hari Krishna Mandir Trust v. State of Maharashtra and Others*[2] wherein it is held as under: (paragraph Nos.100 and 101)

> "100. The High Courts' exercising their jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, not only have the power to issue a Writ of Mandamus or in the nature of Mandamus, but are duty-bound to exercise such power, where the Government or a public authority has failed to exercise or has wrongly exercised discretion conferred upon it by a statute, or a rule, or a policy decision of the Government or has exercised such discretion mala fide, or on irrelevant consideration.
>
> 101. In all such cases, the High Court must issue a Writ of Mandamus and give directions to compel performance in an appropriate and lawful manner of the discretion conferred upon the Government or a public authority."

[2] AIR 2020 Supreme Court 3969.

15. Further, in *Kashmir Wood Products v. Verinag Development Authority and Others*[3], the High Court of Jammu & Kashmir held as under: (paragraph No.8)

> "8. It is astonishing to note that despite there being no dispute as regards the claim of the petitioners, the respondents have sit over the matter for the last more than six years and they have not released the payment in favour of the petitioner. If the requisite funds were not available with the respondents, they had no business to allot the work to the petitioner and if *in spite* of financial constraints, the respondents have made the petitioner to execute the work out of his own funds, it is their bounden duty to reimburse the petitioner at the earliest, that too with interest."

16. The Hon'ble Apex Court in *Surya Constructions v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Others*[4] held as under: (paragraph Nos.3 and 4)

> "3. It is clear, therefore, from the aforesaid Order dated 22.03.2014 that there is no dispute as to the amount that has to be paid to the appellant. Despite this, when the appellant knocked at the doors of the High Court in a Writ Petition being Writ Civil No.25216 of 2014, the *impugned* judgment dated 02.05.2014 [Surya Construction v. State of U.P., 2014 SCC OnLine All 6071] dismissed the Writ Petition stating that disputed questions of fact arise and that the amount due arises out of a contract. We are afraid the High court was wholly incorrect inasmuch as there

[3] 2021 SCC OnLine J&K 814.
[4] (2019) 16 SCC 794.

was no disputed question of fact. On the contrary, the amount payable to the appellant is wholly undisputed. Equally, it is well settled that where the State behaves arbitrarily, even in the realm of contract, the High Court could interfere under Article 226 of the Constitution of India (ABL International Ltd. v. Export Credit Guarantee Corpn. Of India Ltd. [ABL International Ltd. v. Export Credit Guarantee Corpn. of India Ltd., (2004) 3 SCC 553]).

4. This being the case and the work having been completed long back in 2009, we direct Uttar Pradesh Jal Nigam to make the necessary payment within a period of four weeks from today. Given the long period of delay, interest @ 6% p.s. may also be awarded."

17. When an instrumentality of the State acts contrary to the public good and public interest, unfairly, unjustly and unreasonably, in its contractual, constitutional or statutory obligations, it really acts contrary to the constitutional guarantee under Article 14 of the Constitution of India. It is not the case of the respondents that the contract in question was obtained either by fraud or misrepresentation. Therefore, there is no other reason for the respondent authorities in not releasing the amounts in favour of the writ petitioner. Apart from this, when State or State instrumentalities act in an arbitrary manner or fail to act within time, the Writ Court does have jurisdiction to entertain the matter.

18. Having regard to the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, the respondent authorities are

directed to verify and pay the admitted amount for the subject work executed by the petitioner, within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order. It is made clear that the petitioner shall execute an indemnity bond to the effect that in case, if it is found that the petitioner has not executed the subject work, it would repay the amount so paid.

19. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs of the Writ Petition.

As a sequel thereto, the miscellaneous applications, if any, pending in this Writ Petition, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE K. SREENIVASA REDDY

12.10.2026.
DRK

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE K.SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.10010 of 2026

12.10.2026

DRK