APHC010556342026

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

THURSDAY, THE 29th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

WRIT PETITION NO: 30381/2026

Between:

1. M PUSPA LATHA, W/O. M RAMESH, AGED 46 YEARS, OCC BUSINESS, R/O. SHOP NO.62, MINI SHOPING COMPLEX, TIRUMALA, TIRUPATI DISTRICT, PIN -517504.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDRHA PRADESH, REPRESENT BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, ENDOMENTS DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIATE, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, PIN 522239.
2. THE EXCUTIVE OFFICER, TIRUMALA TIRUPATI DEVASTANAM, KT ROAD, TIRUPATI, PIN 517502.
3. THE DEPUTY EXCUTIVE OFFICER PANCHAYAT AND REVENUE, TIRUMALA, TIRUPATI DEVASTANAM, TIRUMALA, PIN 517504.

...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 an order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of a Writ of MANDAMUS, declaring the action of the Respondents in not considering the explanation submitted by the Petitioner on 03-10-2026 as illegal, arbitrary, and contrary to the provisions of the TTD Act and Rules

thereunder, and consequently direct the Respondents to consider the case of the Petitioner for transfer of license in respect of Shop No. 62, Mini Shopping Complex, Tirumala, Tirupati District on par with other persons, and to 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 permit the petitioner to carry out business in Shop No. 62, Mini Shopping Complex, Tirumala, Tirupati District, pending disposal of the above writ petition, and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. P R K AMERANDRA KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR ENDOWMENTS
2. V.DYUMANI (SC for TTD)

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

This Writ Petition came to be filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking the following prayer:

> "…to issue an order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of a Writ of MANDAMUS, declaring the action of the Respondents in not considering the explanation submitted by the Petitioner on 03-10-2026 as illegal, arbitrary, and contrary to the provisions of the TTD Act and Rules thereunder, and consequently direct the Respondents to consider the case of the Petitioner for transfer of license in respect of Shop No. 62, Mini Shopping Complex, Tirumala, Tirupati District on par with other persons, and to pass…"

2. Brief facts of the case are that in the year 1998, the respondent temple acquired private properties situated in Tirumala for implementation of the master plan, by paying compensation in accordance with law. In addition to the compensation, the respondent temple assured such land losers that they would be provided shops in 2nd Sannidhi street. During the said course, the respondent temple acquired the property of one C. Siddamuni, paid compensation and in addition, allotted shop bearing No.62 in Mini Shopping complex and shop Nos.45 and 306 in main shopping complex, Tirumala, in the year 2004 itself. The said C. Siddamuni, during his lifetime, is stated to have sold the said shops in favour of 3rd parties. The shop bearing No.62 situated in mini-shopping complex was purchased by the petitioner herein in

the month of December, 2004 by executing a document. Ever since, the petitioner has been in possession of the same by running business in the said shop, by paying rents to respondents.

3. While the matter stood thus, based on a resolution bearing No.14, dated 30.04.2022 of the respondent board, the petitioner and similarly situated persons were issued a notice dated 25.06.2022 by way of which, explanation was sought as to why the license of shop issued in favour of the petitioner shall not be cancelled for violation of terms and conditions of respondent temple. It is the case of the petitioner that the respondents considered the case of other persons who purchased the shop bearing Nos.45 and 306 from C. Siddamuni and issued proceedings in their favour under the purchaser category. Though the petitioner's case is similar to that of the said persons, the petitioner was repeatedly issued notices and was directed to appear personally before the respondents; pursuant to such notice dated 30.09.2026, the petitioner submitted her explanation on 03.10.2026. The grievance of the petitioner is that without considering her explanation dated 03.10.2026, the respondents have issued a fresh notice on 07.10.2026, directing the petitioner to attend the personal enquiry/hearing scheduled to be conducted on 17.10.2026. Aggrieved by such action of the respondents, the petitioner filed the present writ petition.

4. Heard Sri. P.R.K. Amarendra Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Endowments and Smt. V. Dyumani, learned Standing Counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

5. Perused the entire material available on record. During the course of hearing, learned Standing Counsel furnished a copy of the letter addressed by the 3rd respondent dated 26.10.2026, wherein it is stated that one C. Gokul Kirshna, s/o late C. Siddamuni, in his representations dated 30.03.2024, 07.06.2025 and 15.05.2026 stated that his father never sold the shops allotted in his favour; that one M. Ramesh, husband of the petitioner herein worked as an assistant to his father and continued business in the said shops after demise of C. Siddamuni. The instructions further state that one M. Prasad, filed O.S.No.285 of 2024 on the file of the Court of the IV Additional Junior Civil Judge, Tirupati against the petitioner and four others in respect of the same shop; in the said suit, the said C. Gokul Krishna got impleaded himself as one of the parties.

6. It is further stated in the instructions of the 3rd respondent that pursuant to the explanation submitted by the petitioner on 03.10.2026, the respondents have issued another notice on 10.10.2026 directing the petitioner to attend personal hearing/enquiry on 17.10.2026. Accordingly, the petitioner attended the personal enquiry and submitted a signed statement. An enquiry

is under process and because of rival claims of all the aforementioned persons, the enquiry could not be concluded. Hence, requested to dismiss the writ petition.

7. The case of the petitioner is that she purchased the subject shop from C. Siddamuni in December, 2004. On the other hand, the son of late C. Siddamuni i.e., C. Gokul Krishna made representations to the respondent authorities stating that his father never sold any of the shops allotted in his favour to the petitioner or any other third person; he further requested the respondent authorities to allot the shops in favour of his mother. Furthermore, one M. Prasad is said to have filed O.S.No.285 of 2024 on the file of IV Additional Junior Civil Jduge, Tirupati against the petitioner and four others. In such circumstances, keeping in view the rival claims of the aforementioned persons, this Court cannot direct the respondents to transfer the license pertaining to shop bearing No.62 of mini shopping complex, Tirumala in favour of the petitioner.

8. Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case on hand, this Court feels it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition by directing the respondent Nos.2 and 3 to issue fresh notice to the petitioner, C. Gokul Krishna and M. Ramesh, call for their explanation/objection, conduct an

enquiry and pass appropriate orders after affording an opportunity of hearing, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.

9. Accordingly, with the above direction, this writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

Consequently, Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

Date:29.10.2026
Gss