APHC010530402026

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

MONDAY, THE 26th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 29192/2026

Between:

1. RR INFRA WORKS PVT LTD,, REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING PARTNER, REDDIVARI SINDHURA, D/O REDDIVARI PAMPAPATHI REDDY, AGED 36 YEARS, OCC. CONTRACTOR, RIO 67/C, VENGAL RAO NAGAR, NEAR BRAMHAM SCHOOL, SR NAGAR, HYDERABAD -500038

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDING, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR.522238
2. THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, IRRIGATION CIRCLE, SPSR NELLORE DISTRICT.524003
3. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, ,WRD., IRRIGATION DIVISION, ATMAKUR,SPSR NELLORE DISTRICT.524003
4. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND PLANNING, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT. 522238

...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 Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in withholding the payments of pending amounts of Rs.14,22,097/ (Rupees Fourteen lakhs Twenty Two thousand Ninety Seven Rupees only) even after finalizing the bills payable to the petitioner in relation to the works i.e Modernization Rehabitation of Bogole Cascade in Bogole Akkarajuvarikandriga and Nagulavaram Villages in Bogole mandal in SPSR Nellore District under AP-HATP (World Bank Phase-II) Andhra Pradesh of Saction No. C.E.I.No. 04/2018-19, Dated 17-04-2018, as bad ,illegal, arbitrary, improper, unjust and against the Article 21 of constitution of india and consequently direct the respondents to pay the amounts of Rs.14,22,097/- (Rupees Fourteen lakhs Twenty Two thousand Ninety Seven Rupees only) with interest @ 24 percent oper annum for the delayed amount till date of realization for the works executed by the petitioner and pass any other order or orders as this Honble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

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 direct the respondents to forthwith consider releasing the amounts Rs.14,22,097/- (Rupees Fourteen lakhs Twenty Two thousand Ninety Seven Rupees only) payable to the petitioner herein, pending disposal of the writ petition

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. DEVASRI ROSHAN KANCHARLA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR IRRIGATION COMM AREA DEV
2. GP FOR FINANCE PLANNING

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K.SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO.29192/2026

ORDER:

This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following relief:

> *"…… to issue an appropriate Writ Order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in withholding the payments of pending amounts of Rs.14,22,097/- (Rupees Fourteen Lakhs Twenty Two thousand Ninety Seven Rupees only) even after finalizing the bills payable to the petitioner in relation to the works i.e. "Modernization Rehabitation of Bogole Cascade in Bogole Akkarajuvarikandriga and Nagulavaram Villages in Bogole mandal in SPSR Nellore District, under AP-HATP (World Bank Phase-II) Andhra Pradesh of Saction No. C.E.I.No. 04/2018-19, Dated 17-04-2018", as bad ,illegal, arbitrary, improper, unjust and against the Article 21 of constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to pay the amounts of Rs.14,22,097/- (Rupees Fourteen lakhs Twenty Two thousand Ninety Seven Rupees only) with interest @ 24 percent per annum for the delayed amount till date of realization for the works executed by the petitioner and pass any other order or orders as this Hon'ble*

Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case."

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Assistant Government Pleader for Irrigation appearing for the respondents.

3. Case of the petitioner is that it was entrusted with the aforesaid work and duly executed the same to the satisfaction of the authorities concerned within the stipulated period of the contract. Upon completion of the work, the respondent authorities measured the work and recorded the measurements in the relevant Measurement Book. The respondent authorities did not pay the final bill amount to the petitioner. Despite many requests, the respondent authorities failed to release the amount claimed by the petitioner in the final bill. Aggrieved by the non-payment of the said amount, the petitioner has filed the present Writ Petition.

4. Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Irrigation based on written instructions dated 25.10.2026 received from the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Division, Atmakur, submitted that there is no dispute with regard to the execution of the

subject work by the petitioner. He further submitted that as the Andhra Pradesh Integrated Irrigation Agriculture Transformation Project (APIIATP) Scheme was closed, the office of 3rd respondent requested its higher authorities for releasing of LOC for submitting the final bills for the remaining works in the jurisdiction of this division and that after releasing of LOC, the final bill of the above work will be submitted for payment.

5. Since the amount payable is admitted and undisputed, the Writ Petition is maintainable. In ***M/s Utkal Highways Engineer and Contractors V. Chief General Manager & Ors***[1], it was held at paragraph No.8, as under:

> *"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 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"*.

[1] 2025 SCC online SC 1400

6. Having regard to the fact that there is no dispute with regard to the work executed by the petitioner, the respondent authorities are directed to pay the admitted amount of Rs.13,67,517/- (Rupees Thirteen Lakhs Sixty Seven Thousand Five Hundred and Seventeen Only) to the petitioner within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

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

As a sequel, interlocutory applications pending if any, shall stand closed.

K.SREENIVASA REDDY, J

Date: 26.10.2026.
DRNR/PAB

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K.SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO.29192/2026

DATE: 26.10.2026

DRNR/PAB