IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH: AMARAVATI

WRIT PETITION NO: 19037/2018

% Dated 06.11.2026

U.N.L Sailaja,
W/o. Chandrashekar,
Aged about 50 years,
Occ:- Advocate,
R/o. Plot No.494,
P.N. Colony,
Srikakulam District,
Andhra Pradesh. ….. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Andhra Pradesh,
Rep. by its Principal Secretary Municipal Administration Department,
Secretariat buildings,
Thullur Mandal, Amaravathi,
Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh & Six others.

…. Respondents

JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED ON: 06.11.2026

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA

Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments?

Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law
Reporters/Journals

Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see the fair copy
of the Judgment?

+ HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA

WRIT PETITION No.19037 OF 2026

% Dated 06.11.2026

U.N.L Sailaja,
W/o. Chandrashekar,
Aged about 50 years,
Occ:- Advocate,
R/o. Plot No.494,
P.N. Colony,
Srikakulam District,
Andhra Pradesh. ….. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Andhra Pradesh,
Rep. by its Principal Secretary Municipal Administration Department,
Secretariat buildings,
Thullur Mandal, Amaravathi,
Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh & Six others.

…. Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner : C. Chandrasekhar, learned counsel representing Sri N. Ravi Prasad, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

Counsel for Respondent : Sri V.V. Satish, learned Standing Counsel for APSPDCL respondents and Sri Taddi Nageswara Rao, learned counsel appearing for the 7th respondent.

<GIST:
> HEAD NOTE: 1991 AIR 1902, 1995 AIR 430: 1995 SCC (1) 47 and W.P.No.24396 of 2020(AP)
? Cases referred

Date of reserved for orders : 17.08.2026
Date of pronouncement : 06.11.2026
Date of uploading : 12.11.2026

APHC010408222018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3329]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE 6th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA

WRIT PETITION NO: 19037/2018

Between:

1. U.N.L SAILAJA,, W/O. CHANDRASHEKAR ED ABOUT 50 YEARS, OCC ADVOCATE R/O. PLOT NO. 494, P.N. COLONY, SRIKAKULAM, SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP.BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, THULLUR MANDAL, AMARAVATHI GUNTUR DISTRICT . (A.P.)
2. THE COMMISSIONER, SRIKAKULAM MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, SRIKAKULAM ANDHRA PRADESH.
3. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR CUM SPECIAL OFFICER, SRIKAKULAM MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, SRIKAKULAM ANDHRA PRADESH.
4. THE CMD APEPDCL, VISAKHAPATNAM VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT ANDHRA PRADESH
5. THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER APEPDCL, SRIKAKULAM, SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT. ANDHRA PRADESH.
6. ADE APEPDCL, SRIKAKULAM, SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT ANDHRA

PRADESH

7. PAIDI VENUGOPALAM, S/O LATE SATYAM, AGED ABOUT 55 YEARS, OCC ADVOCATE, PRESIDENT OF PURUSHOTTAMA NAGAR COLONY, SAMKSHEMA SANGAM, R/O PLOT NO. 13, 1ST LANE, P.N. COLONY, SRIKAKULAM, SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT. R7 IMPLEADED AS PER COURTS ORDER DT. 23.07.2026 IN I.A.NO.1 OF 2020

...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 to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of declaring the action of the respondent No. 2 and 3 in alienating open ground/ lung space in the 10th lane of P.N colony, Srikakulam , for the purpose of erecting sub-station, contrary to various statutes and Apex Court Judgments, not considering the representation dated 11.04.2018 and 23.04.2018, and also the action of removing the greenery, trees over the open ground/ lung space, is illegal arbitrary and unconstitutional and consequently direct the respondents 2 to 6 not to erect any electrical sub-station by setting aside any alienation of the above open ground , in favour of respondent No. 4 and 5, to rejunavate the greenery 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 Respondents 4 and 5 not to erect any electrical sub- station over open ground / lung space situated in 10th lane of P.N Colony, Srikakulam town, pending disposal of the main Writ petition and pass

IA NO: 2 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 extend the interim order in W.P.No. 19037 of 2018 dated. 13-06-2018 until further orders and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2019

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

vacate the interim order dated 13-06-2018 in Ia. of 2018 in WP.19037 of 2018 and dismiss the writ petition

IA NO: 1 OF 2020

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 implead the implead party petitioner herein as Respondent No. 7 in W.P.No. 19037 of 2018 and I.As

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. N RAVI PRASAD

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. V V SATISH (SC for APEPDCL)
2. ANCHA PANDURANGA RAO
3. TADDI NAGESWARA RAO
4. GP MUNCIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV(AP)

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA

WRIT PETITION No.19037 OF 2018

ORDER:-

1. This writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, claiming the following direction:

> *"pleased to issue an appropriate writ order or direction more particularly one in the nature of declaring the action of the respondent No.2 and 3 in alienating open ground/ lung space in the 10th lane of P N colony Srikakulam for the purpose of erecting substation contrary to various statutes and Apex Court Judgments not considering the representation dated 11 04 2018 and 23 04 2018 and also the action of removing the greenery trees over the open ground/ lung space is illegal arbitrary and unconstitutional and consequently direct the respondents 2 to 6 not to erect any electrical substation by setting aside any alienation of the above open ground in favour of respondent No 4 and 5 to rejunavate the greenery and pass"*

2. Heard Sri C. Chandrasekhar, learned counsel representing Sri N. Ravi Prasad, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, Sri V.V. Satish, learned Standing Counsel for APSPDCL appearing for the respondents and Sri Taddi Nageswara Rao, learned counsel appearing for the 7th respondent.

3. The petitioner herein is resident of Plot No.494, PN Colony, Srikakulam Town. The said plot forms part of an approved layout in Srikakulam Town, sanctioned under L.P.No.577/83. The common infrastructure, including roads, open spaces and land earmarked for community purpose, was handed over to the municipality vide proceedings dated 16.07.1985. The said layout has comprises of more than 800 houses, and an open space is situated on the northern side of the petitioner's house, which was earmarked as an open space for the benefit of the residents of entire layout. The said open space was developed and maintained by the petitioner along with other residents of the colony.

4. While so, on 21.04.2018, the 2nd respondent herein alienated the aforesaid open space in favour of the 5th respondent herein for the purpose of establishing an electrical sub-station. Aggrieved by the said action, the petitioner submitted a representation to the 2nd respondent, contending that the alienation was illegal and contrary to law and relied upon the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and High Courts to contend that the land earmarked as open space in an approved layout cannot be diverted/utilized for any other purpose.

5. Therefore, the petitioner being an advocate, herself issued a legal notice dated 23.04.2018 to the 2nd respondent, objecting to the proposed alienation of the subject land in favour of the 5th respondent for the establishment of sub-station. The petitioner also submitted representations to the other respondents, including the 5th respondent, requesting them not to proceed with the construction of the electrical sub-station in the open space, by contending that such action would be contrary to law. However, the respondents failed to consider the objections raised and the representation submitted. Hence, the present Writ Petition is filed.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that it is a settled proposition of law that the land earmarked as an open space in an approved layout cannot be diverted or put to any other use contrary to the purpose for which it was originally reserved. It is further contended that even the Government or the local authorities cannot change the use of such land for a

different purpose without following the procedure prescribed by law and satisfying the applicable legal requirements.

7. In support of the said contention, learned counsel for the petitioner relied upon the judgments of Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Bangalore Medical Trust Vs. B.S. Muddappa***[1], ***Pt. Chet Ram Vashist Vs. Municipal Corporation of Delhi***[2] and the judgment of this Court in the case of ***Gottipati Murali Mohan Vs. The State of Andhra Pradesh***[3],

8. Learned counsel submits that the common principle emerging from the aforesaid judgments is that land is earmarked as open space in an approved layout cannot ordinarily be diverted for purposes other than those for which it was reserved, such as parks, playgrounds, and other designated open-space uses, except as permitted by law. It is, therefore, contended that the action of the second respondent in alienating the subject land in favour of the fifth respondent for the establishment of an electrical substation is illegal, arbitrary, and contrary to the settled principles of law. Accordingly, he seeks to have the impugned action set aside.

9. On the other hand, the learned Standing counsel appearing for the respondents submits that a counter-affidavit has been filed on behalf of respondents 4 to 6 herein, wherein the following averments as hereunder:-

> "It is submitted that the 2nd respondent Viz. The Commissioner, Srikakulam municipal corporation, Srikakulam has allotted the land extent of 1111 Sq. yards to the APEPDCL for proposed Indoor substation vide ROC No.6877/2017, dt.22.05.2017. The proposed 33/11 KV Sub-station is Indoor type; total equipment of the Sub-station is covered with slab roof. No such ill

[1] 1991 AIR 1902
[2] 1995 AIR 430: 1995 SCC (1) 47
[3] W.P.No.24396 of 2020

health or other adverse effects on the health of public. Further there are 38 Nos.of 33/11 KV indoor Sub-station are existing in EPDCL already and no where such complaints received. The APEPDCL will take adequate security measures in all aspects.

It is submitted that the APEPDCL has not uprooted any trees. It is not correct there is another substation at a distance of 200 mts, but There is a 33/11 KV Sub-station named as Gujarathipeta sub-station which is 2.5 KL circuit length from the proposed Indoor Sub-station which is located in the vicinity of Kusalapuram Panchayat of Etcherla mandal, which is intended for feeding of exclusive loads of Etcherla mandal and only 5% loads of urban areas are being fed from that Sub-station.

It is submitted that, the consumers of PN Colony, Gujarathipeta, Fazulbagpeta etc., of Srikakulam Muncipal Corporation are residing on the west side of the Nagavali River. These areas are getting supply from the 33/11 KV Srikakulam Sub-station through 11 KV Santinagar feeder and 11 KV Gujarathipeta feeder of 33/11 KV Gujarathipeta SS located in Kusalapuram panchayat. The peak load currents on those feeders are crossing more than 110 Amps due to abrupt load growth in this area. More than 50% of the consumers in the area are having max connected loads. The total consumers are nearly 7000 Nos. There is Nagavali River between 33/11 KV Srikakulam Sub-station and PN Colony.

It is submitted that the existing 33/11KV Sub-Station situated at Govt. Arts College Road, Srikakulam is catering the power requirement of residents of P.N.Colony, Fazulbaghpeta, Gujarathipeta etc... As seen from the last few years there is a drastic increase of electrical power needs day by day and the existing int.tructure for supplying power to cater to these loads is getting over loaded causing frequent interruptions of power supply and low voltage to the public. Hence Srikakulam Mncipal Corporation passed the resolution to allot land for construction of new sub-station to meet the demand of power requirements and supply of reliable power to the public of P.N.Colony, Fazulbaghpeta, Gujarathipeta etc.,. The Muncipal Corporation, Srikakulam handed over advance possession of the Government land admeasuring 1111Sq. Yds in SY No. 98 of Fazulbaghpeta waru (Seepannaidupeta) in favour of APEPDCL for construction of Sub-Station to cater the Electrical Power needs of residents of P.N.Colony, Fazulbaghpeta, Gujarathipeta etc... It is submitted that this Sub-station fulfils the needs of large number of consumers from Low Voltage Problem and frequent interruptions. The APEPDCL constructed the Sub-Station in the interest of Consumer Satisfaction and to provide qualitative, un-interrupted power supply to the general public and sm scale commercial services. It is here with submitted for kind perusal of this honorable court."

10. Learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents submits that the 2nd respondent-corporation passed Resolution No.11/2017, dated 31.03.2017, proposing the allotment of an extent of Ac.0.22 cents, equivalent to 1,111 square yards or 928.8 square meters, for the establishment of a 33/11 kV elelctrical substation to address the low-voltage problem and to meet

the electricity requirements of PN Colony and surrounding colonies. He also submits that the proposal was initiated in response to the request made by the residents of the colony and their elected representatives, with a view to ensuring an uninterrupted and effective power supply to the colony. Accordingly, the proposal for alienation was forwarded to the 1st respondent on 05.06.2018.

11. He further submits that, as admitted by the petitioner in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, the approved layout of P.N. Colony, sanctioned under L.P.No.577/83, caters to a population of approximately 7,000 residents. He contended that the layout comprises an extent of Ac.2.88 cents, towards open spaces together with amenities and utilities and other area earmarked for schools, parks, and a water tank, together with roads and other community facilities, which were handed over to the 2nd respondent-Municipality and vested in it for the purpose of providing civic amenities to the residents.

12. He also submitted that, under Rule 13(1) of Andhra Pradesh Land Development (Layout and Sub-Division) Rules, 2017 [for short “the Rules, 2017”], the prescribed areas for amenities, utilities, public open spaces, and roads are required to be earmarked in accordance with the extent of the layout. It is submitted that, for layouts exceeding five hectares, 3% of the layout area is required to be reserved for amenities, 1% for utilities, 10% for public open space, and 30% for roads and related works, whereas the corresponding requirements for layouts below five hectares are stated to be 2% for amenities and 0.5% for utilities.

13. He contends that, in the instant case, the areas earmarked for road work and other common facilities were handed over to the 2nd respondent-Corporation for providing the requisite amenities and utilities to the residents. He further submits that areas reserved for amenities and utilities are intended to serve the needs of the residents of the layout. In view of the technical survey conducted by the concerned authorities, and having regard to the low-voltage problem prevailing in the locality and the need to ensure an uninterrupted power supply, the respondents 4 to 6 decided to establish a 33/11 kV electrical substation in the area earmarked for amenities and utilities.

14. He further submits that the extent proposed to be alienated in favour of respondents 4 to 6 is only Ac.0.22 cents, equivalent to 1,111 square yards or 928.8 square metres, out of the total layout area stated to be Ac.2.88 cents or 11654 square meters. He also submits that the proposed allotment constitutes only a small portion of the total layout area and would not affect the prescribed extent of public open space reserved under the Rules, 2017. He, therefore, contended that the proposed establishment of the electrical substation is intended to provide an essential public utility/amenity and would not result in the deprivation of the residents' entitlement to the prescribed open space.

15. He further submits that Sri C. Chandrashekhar, learned counsel for the petitioner, is the husband of the petitioner herein and had earlier filed W.P.(PIL).No.169 of 2018 challenging the allotment and alienation of the subject land in favour of the respondents 4 to 6. He also submits that the

husband of the petitioner is a Class-I contractor and the present Writ Petition has been filed by his wife, who is also an advocate.

16. Learned Standing Counsel contends that the conduct of the petitioner and her husband raises questions regarding the bona fides of the present proceedings is contrary to the Advocates Act, 1961. He further alleged that the petitioner's husband had been using the open space for private commercial purposes, including parking heavy road-construction machinery such as trucks, road rollers, and tar-paving machines owned by him. He also submitted that the petitioner herself issued a legal notice to the 2nd respondent and thereafter instituted the present writ petition.

17. He further submits that the P.N. Colony Association itself passed a resolution supporting the establishment of the proposed 33/11 kV electrical substation to address the low-voltage problem and meet the electricity requirements of the residents of the colony.

18. Learned Standing Counsel further submitted that the petitioner’s contention that two other substations are situated within a distance of 200 meters from PN colony is incorrect. He contended that that the nearest existing substation is situated approximately 2.5 kilometres away, on the northern side of the Nagavali River, making it difficult to promptly address power supply disruptions and meet the electricity requirements of the PN colony and its surrounding areas. Therefore, considering the representations made by the residents and the technical requirements, the subject site was

identified for establishing the proposed 33/11 kV electrical substation as an essential public utility.

19. Learned counsel appearing for the 7th respondent submit that the President of the P.N. Colony association has been impleaded as the 7th respondent in the present Writ Petition and had also filed a counter-affidavit. In the said counter-affidavit, it is contended that the petitioner is pursuing her personal interests under the guise of adopting the concept of public interest, either independently or through her husband.

20. He further submits that, having regard to the ground realities, the petitioner herein is pursuing her personal interests under the guise of public interest, contrary to the Rules, 2017, whereas the proposed electrical substation is essential to meet the electricity requirements of the residents of PN Colony and to provide the necessary public utility/amenity to the locality.

21. He further submits that the P.N. Colony association submitted representation to the respondents 1 & 2 seeking the establishment of a 33/11 kV substation to ensure an adequate power supply to P.N.Colony and the surrounding areas. He contended that the construction of the proposed electrical substation 33/11 KV Sub-station was entrusted to G.S. Projects and that the work has substantially progressed and was at an advanced stage of completion. In the meantime, the petitioner's husband instituted W.P.(PIL).No.169 of 2018 challenging the allotment and alienation of the subject land in favour of the respondents 4 to 6. The said PIL was closed on

21.01.2019. He also submits that, therefore, the petitioner instituted the present Writ Petition raising allegations against the proposed establishment of the electrical substation.

22. Learned counsel appearing for the 7th respondent submits that the petitioner's husband being a Class-I contractor, had allegedly been using the subject open space for parking vehicles and machinery, including cars, lorries, JCDs, and other construction equipment, thereby preventing the residence of P.N. Colony for using the said space for its intended purpose.

23. He further contended that, after the PIL instituted by the petitioner's husband was closed, the present writ petition was filed through his wife, she is also represented by him as counsel in this Writ Petition. He also contend that the present proceedings are intended to advance private interests at the expense of the larger public interest, particularly the provision of essential civic amenities and uninterrupted electricity supply to the residents of P.N. Colony. He, therefore, submits that the present writ petition is devoid of merit and is liable to be dismissed.

24. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents, and the learned counsel appearing for the 7th respondent and upon perusal of the material available on record, this Court deems it appropriate to examine the relevant provisions governing the reservation of land for amenities, utilities,

and public open spaces and accordingly, Rule 13(1) of the Rules, 2017 is extracted hereunder:

> **"Rules-13. Reservation and Allotment of Land.**
>
> (1) The reservation and allotment of land for various purposes in the land/layout development shall be as follows:
>
> (a) In layouts of 5 Ha. and below: 2% of the layout area for Amenities and 0.5% of the layout area for Utilities.
>
> (b) In layouts of above 5 hc: 3% of the layout area for Amenities and 1% of the layout area for Utilities..
>
> (c) 10% of the layout area for Public Open Space.
>
> (d) 30% of the layout area for Roads. In case of roads area arrived below 30% the public open space shall be increased proportionately so that the area under roads and open space put together shall be minimum of 40% of layout area."

25. It is an admitted fact the petitioner herein is the wife of the petitioner in W.P.(PIL) No.169 of 2018. It is not in dispute that the said PIL was closed and observed as under:-

> "At the time when the matter is taken up for hearing, the learned Standing Counsel for Eastern Power Distribution Co. Ltd. would submit that wife of the petitioner filed W.P.No.19037 of 2018 seeking identical relief in which there is an order of status quo. Having regard to the above, the Writ Petition (PIL) is closed."

26. As contended by the respondents that, having failed to obtain the desired relief in the said proceedings, the petitioner's husband had initiated the present writ petition through his wife, she is represented by her husband as counsel in this Writ Petition. It is also not in dispute that the President of the P.N. Colony Association, representing the interests of the residents, submitted a representation seeking the establishment of a 33/11 kV electrical substation at the subject site to meet the electricity requirements of the residents of the layout/colony.

27. It is also an admitted fact that the 2nd respondent, in whom the land earmarked for open spaces, amenities, and utilities had vested, passed Resolution No. 11/2017, dated 31.03.2017, proposing to allot an extent of Ac.0.22 cents, equivalent to 1,111 square yards or 928.8 square metres, for the establishment of a 33/11 kV electrical substation to address the electricity requirements of P.N. Colony/subject layout.

28. Whereas, the total extent of the layout is approximately 3,25,000 square metres, equivalent to more than 25 acres or 10 hectares. Out of the total layout area, an extent of Ac.2.88 cents was earmarked for open spaces together with for providing amenities and utilities to the residents and the entire extent was handed over to the 2nd respondent-Municipality. Out of the said area, the 2nd respondent passed a resolution proposing to allot an extent of Ac.0.22 cents for establishing the subject electrical substation, which, according to the respondents, constitutes less than 10% of the area earmarked for open space and within 4% meant for amenities and utilities related purposes.

29. On perusal of Rule 13(1) of the Rules, 2017, it is evident that a prescribed portion of the layout area is required to be reserved for providing amenities and utilities for the benefit of the residents. In the present case, that the proposed allotment of Ac.0.22 cents out of the extent of Ac.2.88 cents earmarked for open space and related purposes is in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Rules, 2017.

30. The Judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Court relied upon by learned counsel for the petitioner lay down the principles governing the protection of open spaces earmarked in approved layouts. However, the applicability of the said judgments to the facts of the present case requires consideration in the light of the nature and purpose of the proposed allotment.

31. The aforesaid judgments relied upon by the learned counsel for the petitioner are not applicable on the facts of the present case, for the reason that sufficient open space would continue to remain available even after the proposed allotment. The subject land is stated to have been earmarked for amenities and utilities, and proposed electrical substation is intended to provide is an essential public amenity/utility to the residents of the P.N. Colony.

32. This Court is of the view that land earmarked as open space in an approved layout and cannot be diverted for any other purpose contrary to the applicable statutory provisions and the purpose for which it was reserved. However, in the present case, the proposed allotment is stated to be for establishing an electrical substation, which is an essential public amenity/utility, in the area earmarked for amenities and utilities, in accordance with the Rules, 2017. Therefore, subject to compliance with the applicable statutory requirements, the allotment proposed by the 2nd respondent in favour of respondents 4 to 6 for the establishment of the subject electrical substation cannot be held to be contrary to law merely on the ground that the land forms part of the area reserved for common purposes.

33. The learned Standing Counsel for the respondents and learned counsel appearing for the 7th respondent contend that the petitioner and her husband are pursuing their personal interests at the expense of the public interest of the residents of P.N. Colony. It is further alleged that the petitioner's husband had been using the subject open space for parking his vehicles and construction machinery being a class I contractor. The petitioner did not choose to file any reply rebutting these allegations. As contended by the learned Standing Counsel that as per the technical experts of the respondents that the electrical substation can be installed/erected even in the residential area for supply of uninterrupted and effective distribution of power for all the residents of colony is a merit and valid submission and should be considered. Therefore, for the foregoing reasons as stated above and upon consideration of the material available on record and the applicable provisions of the Rules, 2017, this Court finds no sufficient ground to grant the relief sought by the petitioner. Hence, the writ petition is devoid of merits and liable to be dismissed.

34. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

35. Consequently, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA

Date: 06-11-2026

Note:-

Issue C.C. by 12.11.2026 and LR copy to be marked and transferred to the LR folder

B/o.

BSM

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VENKATESWARLU NIMMAGADDA

WRIT PETITION No.19037 OF 2018

Date:- 06-11-2026

W

Note:-
Issue C.C. by 12.11.2026 and transferred to the LR folder
B/o.
BSM