THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE PURUSHOTTAM KUMAR CHINTALAPUDI

W.P.No.31132 of 2026

ORDER:

This Writ Petition is moved by way of House Motion, which was taken up on 23.10.2026, and the matter is posted for today. In view of the specific assertion of the petitioner that the extended period for filing nominations for the Ward Members expires today, i.e., 24.10.2026, the matter is taken up.

2. This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the following relief:

> "For the reasons stated in the accompanying affidavit, it is hereby prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ, Order, or Direction declaring the failure of the respondent authorities to consider and provide an effective remedy for the petitioner's grievance concerning his opportunity to contest for the office of Chairperson of Mydukur Municipality, in the context of Notification No.1135/SEC-F1/2026 dated 22.10.2026, as arbitrary and contrary to Articles 14, 243K and 243ZA of the Constitution of India and the order dated 21.10.2026 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP(C) No.37476 of 2026 and to pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, just and proper in the circumstances of the case. Consequently direct the respondents to permit to file the nomination as chair person of Mydukur Municipality."

3. Heard Sri P. Veera Reddy, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner; Sri N. Ashwani Kumar, learned Standing Counsel representing the State Election Commission – respondent No.1 and Election Officers-respondent Nos.3, 4 & 5, learned Government Pleader for Municipal Administration and Urban Development for respondent Nos.2; learned Government Pleader for Home for respondent No.6 (learned counsels

appeared through virtual mode). Learned counsel for petitioners have submitted that, there is urgency in the matter, as the nominations closes by 24.10.2026, urged to take up the matter and adjudicate upon.

Facts of the Case:

4. The respondent No.1, the State Election Commission, issued a notification for conducting the Elections for 100Urban Local Bodies (ULB's) i.e. Municipalities and Nagar Panchayats, including Mydukur Municipality, for electing Chairpersons and Ward Members,MPTCs/ZPTCs and Gram Panchayats vide Notification No.738/SEC-F1/2026-7 (hereinafter referred to as the 'original notification'). The notification is as follows:

"**A.P. STATE ELECTION COMMISSION**

1st Floor, New HODs Building, M.G. Road, Vijayawada-520 010.

NOTIFICATION

No.738/SEC-F1/2026-7Date: 14.10.2026

In exercise of the powers conferred under Article 243-ZA of the Constitution of India, Sections 10-A & 10-B of the Andhra Pradesh Municipalities Act, 1965 and the Andhra Pradesh Municipalities (Conduct of Election of Members) Rules, 2026 issued thereunder, the State Election Commissioner, hereby, calls upon the registered voters of the Municipalities and Nagar Panchayats specified in the Annexure appended to this Notification, to elect Chairperson of their respective Municipality/Nagar Panchayat and also Members of their respective Wards. and notifies the following programme for conduct of elections.

ELECTION PROGRAMME

1.	Display of Ward-wise Electoral Rolls by Election Officer under Rule 5 of the said Rules	**16.10.2026 (Friday)**
2.	Date on which the Election Officer shall issue the election notice under Rule 6 of the above Rules	**16.10.2026 (Friday)** (From this date onwards, Nominations can be filed from 11:00 AM to 3:00 PM)

3.	Last Date for filing Nominations	**18.10.2026 (Sunday)** (Up to 3:00 PM)
4.	Scrutiny of Nominations	**19.10.2026 (Monday)** (From 11:00 AM onwards)
5.	Last date for Withdrawal of Candidatures	**21.10.2026 (Wednesday)** (Not later than 3:00 PM)
6.	Date of publication of the List of contesting candidates	**21.10.2026 (Wednesday)** (After 3:00 PM)
7.	Date of poll	**28.10.2026 (Wednesday)** (From 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM)
8.	Date of re-poll, if any	**29.10.2026 (Thursday)** (From 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM)
9.	Date of counting	**30.10.2026 (Friday)** (From 8:00 AM onwards)

Anil Chandra Punetha, IAS (Retd)
State Election Commissioner"

5. Pursuant to the aforesaid notification, the respective persons intending to contest for the posts of Chairpersons and Ward Members of the respective wards of the Urban Local Bodies filed their nominations. It is alleged that, in the process of filing nominations, certain obstructions were caused, as a result of which the intending candidates could not file their nominations within the stipulated time.

6. Then Yuvajana Sramika Rythu Congress Party (YSR Congress Party) has approached this court, seeking a direction to extend the time for filing nominations in view of obstructions caused in filing nominations. The matter was carried to the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No.37476 of 2026. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, vide order dated 21.10.2026, issued directions to the State Election Commission to extend the time for filing nominations. The relevant portion of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is extracted hereunder:

> "17. Keeping in mind these propositions governing election law and the materials in the form of representations supported by documents/electronic evidence, we are of the *prima*

*facie*opinion that the petitioner has made out a case to pass the following directions:

> (i) The State Election Commission shall postpone the publication of the final list of candidates till 25.10.2026. In the meantime, the State Election Commission shall consider the representations made by petitioner party and/or various candidates, including evidentiary material as well as electronic evidence placed before it and take a decision to extend the last date of filing nominations in urban local bodies wherever it is of the view that candidates were unable to file their nominations due to law and order situation. Such decision shall be taken by the Election Commission positively by tomorrow and wherever the Election Commission chooses to extend the time, such time shall be extended not less than 48 hours from the time of publishing such decision by amending the election notification.
>
> (ii) The Commission shall also make additional arrangements to file nominations at the District Headquarters before the District Collector, wherever necessary.
>
> (iii) In addition to the aforesaid, State Election Commission shall take all necessary steps to remove apprehensions from the mind of the petitioner and prospective candidates that they have a free and fair chance of participating in the election by filing their nominations. The Election Commission shall submit its compliance report on the adjourned date.
>
> (iv) The Director General of Police shall take all necessary steps to maintain police *bandobast*, CCTV coverage at nomination centers and provide necessary protection to candidates who would come to the centres concerned to file their nominations and file compliance report before this Court on the adjourned date.
>
> 18. Post the matter on 27.10.2026."

7. Pursuant to the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and in compliance thereof, respondent No.1, the State Election Commission, issued Notification dated 22.10.2026, vide Notification No.1135/SEC-

F1/2026 (hereinafter referred to as the 'extended notification'). The notification reads as follows:

"**A.P. STATE ELECTION COMMISSION**

1st Floor, New HODs Building, M.G. Road, Vijayawada-520010.

NOTIFICATION

No. 1135/SEC-F1/2026Date: 22.10.2026

WHEREAS, the State Election Commission has issued Notifications on 14.10.2026 for conduct of 2nd Ordinary Elections to 13 Municipal Corporations and 87 Municipalities / Nagar Panchayats in the State. As per the Election Schedule, the Nomination process has been conducted from 16.10.2026 to 18.10.2026 and the Scrutiny of Nominations by the Returning Officers / Election Officers concerned on 19.10.2026. The Withdrawal of Candidatures was allowed up to 3 PM on 21.10.2026.

WHEREAS, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLA(C) No. 37476/2026, dt. 21.10.2026 has directed, among other things, that the State Election Commission shall postpone the publication of the final list of candidates till 25.10.2026 and that in the meantime, the Commission shall consider the representations made by petitioner party and/or various candidates, including evidentiary material as well as electronic evidence placed before it and take a decision to extend the last date of filing nominations in Urban Local Bodies wherever it is of the view that candidates were unable to file their nominations due to law and order situation. It was further directed that such decision shall be taken by the Commission positively by tomorrow i.e., 22.10.2026 and wherever the Commission chooses to extend the time, such time shall be extended not less than 48 hours from the time of publishing such decision by amending the Election Notification.

WHEREAS, in compliance to the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the State Election Commission has, by order dt.21.10.2026, issued directions that further election process in respect of all 100 Urban Local Bodies in the State shall be stopped forthwith and that as directed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the Commission will issue an order on 22.10.2026.

WHERAS, the State Election Commission has examined the reports received from the Collectors & District Election Authorities and the Commissioners of Police / Superintendents of Police in respect of 100 Urban Local Bodies and also examined the

representations made by petitioner party and / or various candidates. The Commission has also carefully examined all other evidentiary material including electronic evidence brought to the notice of the Commission.

WHEREAS, the Commission has observed that in certain Urban Local Bodies, some candidates, who were willing to contest, have been intimidated or attacked or their Nomination Papers were torn or by any adversarial circumstance prevented such candidates from filing Nominations. The State Election Commission has also observed that those incidents have occurred in 4 Urban Local Bodies and decided to provide them an opportunity to file Nominations and to take appropriate steps to ensure that they are not to be deprived of their opportunity to contest the Urban Local Body Elections.

NOW, therefore, the State Election Commission, in compliance with the orders dt.21.10.2026 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLA(C) No. 37476/2026 and in exercise of powers conferred under Article 243K and Article 243ZA of the Constitution of India and relevant provisions of the Municipal Acts, hereby order to extend the Nomination process in 4 Urban Local Bodies indicated in the Annexure for 48 hours i.e., on 23.10.2026 & 24.10.2026 from 11 AM to 3 PM at the places already specified by the Returning Officers / Election Officers on 16.10.2026. In addition to the already notified Nomination Receiving Centres, Nomination Papers shall also be received in the premises of the Collectorates as specified by the Collector & District Election Authority concerned. The State Election Commission also issues the following revised schedule for those Urban Local Bodies mentioned in the Annexure.

Activity	**Date appointed as per revised schedule in compliance with the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India**
Extended Nomination process	23.10.2026 & 24.10.2026 (From 11:00 AM to 3:00 PM)
Scrutiny of the fresh Nominations received during the extended Nomination Process	25.10.2026 (From 8:00 AM onwards)

Activity	Date appointed as per revised schedule in compliance with the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India
Last date of Withdrawal of Candidatures (for only those candidates who filed fresh Nominations)	25.10.2026 (Up to 3:00 PM)

The State Election Commission, in exercise of the powers conferred under Article 243K and Article 243ZA of the Constitution of India and relevant provisions of the Municipal Acts, also issue the following revised schedule from the stage of Publication of final list of Contesting Candidates for all 100 Urban Local Bodies, including 4 Urban Local Bodies mentioned in the Annexure, in respect of which the Nomination process has been extended and issued the above revised schedule, and also Vizianagaram Municipal Corporation. Revised Schedule for Indirect Election will be released separately.

Activity	Date appointed as per revised schedule in compliance with the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India
Date of Publication of final list of Contesting Candidates	25.10.2026 (After 3:00 PM)
Date of Poll	01.11.2026 (From 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM)
Date of Re-poll, if any	02.11.2026 (From 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM)
Date of Counting	03.11.2026 (From 8:00 AM onwards)

Sd/- Anil Chandra Punetha, IAS (Retd)
State Election Commissioner

// Attested //
Joint Director

ANNEXURE

(Annexure to Notification No. 1135/SEC-F1/2026, dt. 22.10.2026)

Sl. No.	Name of the District	Name of the Urban Local Body	Wards Nos. where Nomination process is extended
1	YSR Kadapa	Kadapa Municipal Corporation (11 wards)	Ward No. 6, Ward No.11, Ward No.13, Ward No.15, Ward No 16, Ward No.17, Ward No.24, Ward No.31, Ward No.34, Ward No.52 & Ward No.55
2	YSR Kadapa	Rajampet Municipality (11 wards)	Ward No.6, Ward No.12, Ward No.13, Ward No.14, Ward No.17, Ward No.19, Ward No.23, Ward No.24, Ward No.25, Ward No.26 & Ward No.27
3	YSR Kadapa	Mydukur Municipality (32 wards)	All wards
4	Tirupati	Tirupati Municipal Corporation (18 wards)	Ward No.1, Ward No.2, Ward No.3, Ward No.4, Ward No.5, Ward No.6, Ward No.9, Ward No.11, Ward No.12, Ward No.13, Ward No.14, Ward No.19, Ward No.55, Ward No.56, Ward No.57, Ward No.59, Ward No.65 & Ward No.66

Sd/- Anil Chandra Punetha, IAS (Retd)
State Election Commissioner

// Attested //
Joint Director"

8. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner is one of the members of the YSR Congress Party aspiring to file nomination for the office of Chairperson of Mydukur Municipality. The petitioner intended to contest

the said election, but he could not file his nomination during the original notification. He was prevented from filing his nomination during the original notification period. In view of the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and the extended notification issued thereon, extending time to file nominations till 24.10.2026, for all the 32 wards of the Mydukur Municipality, he intended to file his nomination for the post of Chairperson of Mydukur Municipality on behalf of the YSR Congress Party. When he went to file his nomination on 23.10.2026, the returning officer objected to file and receive nominations as there is no such extension of time for the post of chairpersons and the reopening or extension of time for filing nominations is applicable only to the 32 wards of the Municipality and not to the post of Chairperson.

9. This objection has prompted him to approach this court under the present writ petition.

10. The extended notification dated 22.10.2026 describes the extended nomination process referring for the ward members and it does not expressly refer the extension of nomination process for the office of Chairperson of Mydukur Municipality. The earlier notification dated 19.10.2026 stopped for both the Chairperson and Ward Member election processes, as the disruption had occurred at the common premises used for both.

11. On 23.10.2026, being the first day of the extended nomination period the petitioner went to the nomination centre at about 11.00 a.m. to tender his nomination for the office of Chairperson of Mydukur Municipality. His nomination was objected to on the ground that the extended period was not applicable to the post of Chairperson

12. The respondents have made their oral submissions.

Submissions of Learned Counsels:

13. Sri P. Veera Reddy, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submitted that, the original notification dated 14.10.2026 included the Chairperson's and Ward Members of all municipalities in the State of Andhra Pradesh in the urban local bodies. Prior to the amendment, the election of Chairperson's was indirect, but subsequent to the amendments dated 19.08.2026, the elections for the posts of Chairpersons to be held under direct mode, through the public voting. The original notification dated 14.10.2026 was issued after the amendments, for both the positions i.e. for Chairpersons and Ward Members, to be held simultaneously.

14. Though the initial notification included the Chairpersons and Ward Members, in the extended notification, it only referred Ward members. It does not specifically mention the Chairpersons.

15. The present petitioner approached the Returning Officer to file his nomination for the post of Chairperson under the second notification dated 22.10.2026, on the ground that he was previously prevented from filing his nomination and, hence, he is entitled to file his nomination under the extended notification in respect of Mydukur Municipality, but he was prevented from filing his nomination with an observation that the extension of time for filing nominations for the post of Chairperson was not prescribed under the extended notification dated 22.10.2026.

16. This made the petitioner approach this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking relief that he shall be permitted to file his nomination in the extended notification. The argument is he was previously prevented from filing his nomination. Now he is entitled to.

17. Learned Senior Counsel vehemently argued that when the original notification included the elections for Chairpersons and Ward Members, the extended notification obviously with all means includes for Chairpersons also. However, under a wrong interpretation, respondent

No.1 is not considering that the extension also applies to the Chairpersons.

18. He further argued that, this is violation to the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court. Object of the amended Rule is direct elections for both the posts and simultaneously under one notification. But the respondent No.1 with their own interpretation, respondent No.1 going against the rules and depriving his right to contest. Hence, sought to consider his relief.

19. In reply, Sri N. Ashwani Kumar, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1-State Election Commission, submitted that under the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, at paragraph 17(i), a direction was given to the State Election Commission that it shall consider the representations made by the petitioner party and/or various candidates, including evidentiary material as well as electronic evidence placed before it, and "take a decision" to extend the last date for filing nominations in urban local bodies "wherever" it is of the view that candidates were unable to file their nominations due to the law and order situation.

20. His argument is that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has given discretion to the State Election Commission to take a decision to extend the last date for filing nominations, subject to its satisfaction wherever the candidates were prevented from filing their nominations.

21. Respondent No.1 pursuant to the directions, called for the inputs from the District Collectors, District Election Authorities and Commissioners of Police/Superintendents of Police in respect of all 100 urban local bodies. It also examined the representations made by the petitioner party and/or various candidates.

22. On examination of all evidentiary material, including electronic evidence brought to its notice, respondent No.1 identified the

disturbances in only 4 urban local bodies, that candidates who were willing to contest had been intimidated and/or attacked, or their nomination papers were torn, or they were prevented by other adverse circumstances from filing their nominations.

23. Then the respondent No.1 decided to provide an opportunity to such candidates to file their nominations and took appropriate steps to ensure that they are not deprived of their opportunity to contest the urban local body elections.

24. Learned counsel submitted that the State Election Commission, after verification and consideration of the information, had decided that the alleged incidents occurred only in four urban local bodies for the wards and, therefore, extended the time for filing nominations in those four urban local bodies, for Ward members.

25. The identified 4 ULBs with wards is as follows:

"Annexure to Notification No.1135/SEC-F1/2026 dated 22.10.2026:

Sl. No.	**Name of the District**	**Name of the Urban Local Body**	**Wards Nos. where Nomination process is extended**
1	YSR Kadapa	Kadapa Municipal Corporation (11 wards)	Ward Nos. 6, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 24, 31, 34, 52 & 55
2	YSR Kadapa	Rajampet Municipality (11 wards)	Ward Nos. 6, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26 & 27
3	YSR Kadapa	Mydukur Municipality (32 wards)	All wards
4	Tirupati	Tirupati Municipal Corporation (18 wards)	Ward Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 55, 56, 57, 59, 65 & 66

26. Learned counsel submitted that there were no reports regarding the alleged prevention of candidates from filing their nominations for the post

of Chairperson of Mydukur Municipality or at any other places. For that reason, after consideration, respondent No.1 did not extend the time for filing nominations for the said post.

27. According to respondent No.1, since there was no adverse information regarding to the posts of Chairperson, the State Election Commission consciously took a decision to extend the time for filing nominations only for Ward Members in four urban local bodies, but not for Chairpersons.

28. He submitted that this was the decision of the State Election Commission and it cannot be interpreted that the State Election Commission had extended the time for filing nominations for the post of Chairperson.

29. Learned counsel for respondent No.1 relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Election Commission of India v. State of Tamil Nadu and Others***[1], and submitted that State Election Commission is the sole authority to decide the Election Schedule. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (C) No. 37476 of 2026while considering the grounds of State Election Commission has given discretion to it. Therefore, petitioner's interpretation that the extended notification includes for the post of Chairpersons is not correct. It is only for the ward members in four urban local bodies. Learned counsel further submitted that, the matter relating to ULBs is pending before Honble Supreme Court, and it listed on 27.10.2026 for the report of the respondents. This present writ petition, thus cannot go into the orders of Hon'be Supreme, the respondent No. 1, need to file his report and for the present case, there is, no incidents have occurred for the nominations to Chairperson and thus sought to dismiss the petition.

30. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner in reply argued that the said interpretation is contrary to the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The

[1] 1995 Supp (3) SCC 379

extension of time granted by the Commission also includes the nominations for the posts of Chairpersons.

31. At this stage, learned senior counsel submitted that in W.P.No.30947 of 2026, the petitioner approached this Court seeking relief for filing nominations with police protection, and this Court disposed of the same.

32. I have heard both learned counsels and gone through the record.

Discussion:

33. Learned counsels have fairly submitted that the original notification included the posts of Chairpersons and ward members. The notification was issued to conduct elections for both posts simultaneously. Learned counsels further submitted that, in the original notification, aspiring candidates filed their nominations for the post of Chairperson, including in the Mydukur municipality.

34. According to respondent No.1 (State Election Commission), out of 100 ULBs, only 4 ULBs were found eligible for an extension of time. The respondent No. 1 took this decision after analyzing the reports received from the respective authorities. Thus, upon satisfaction, they issued an extended notification for only 4 ULBs. As extracted, it specifically refers to “wards” only.

35. The writ petition does not challenge whether the extension for the 4 ULBs is proper. The challenge concern is, its failure to include the Chairperson posts.

36. The order of the Hon’ble Supreme Court, specifically directs that

> "……..the State Election Commission shall consider the representations of the parties and various candidates, including evidentiary material, and decide whether to extend the last date for filing nominations in urban local bodies wherever it finds that **candidates were unable to file their nominations** due to the law - and - order situation……."

37. The respondents contend that the directions are that, extension of time only in places where, in respondent No.1's view, candidates could not file their nominations due to the law-and-order situation. The respondents state that they acted accordingly, with the relevant information and identified only 4 ULBs out of 100. Extension was given for the said 4 ULBs that too for wards only.

38. The relevant portion of the extended notification states as follows:

> "……..hereby order to extend the nomination process in 4 Urban Local Bodies indicated in the Annexure for 48 hours i.e., on 23.10.2026 and 24.10.2026……."

39. The extension is given under the annexure of the notification.

- Annexure -

Sl. No.	**Name of the District**	**Name of the Urban Local Body**	**Wards Nos. where Nomination process is extended**
1	YSR Kadapa	Kadapa Municipal Corporation (11 wards)	Ward Nos. 6, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 24, 31, 34, 52 & 55
2	YSR Kadapa	Rajampet Municipality (11 wards)	Ward Nos. 6, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26 & 27
3	YSR Kadapa	Mydukur Municipality (32 wards)	All wards
4	Tirupati	Tirupati Municipal Corporation (18 wards)	Ward Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 55, 56, 57, 59, 65 & 66

40. The annexure specifically mentions only wards. In Kadapa Municipal Corporation, Rajampet Municipality, and Tirupati Municipal Corporation, only certain wards received an extension, with specific ward numbers. In Mydukur Municipality, all 32 wards received an extension. The specific ward numbers are provided.

41. No extension of time was granted for any Chairperson or ward member posts for other ULBs, and for chairperson posts in the 4 ULBs. Their contention is, there are no such incidents happened warranting extensions of time for posts of chairpersons.

42. The petitioner's contention is for the Mydukur Municipality, and not the other ULBs. All 32 wards in Mydukur Municipality received an extension. The contention is that, since all wards in Mydukur received an extension of time to file nominations, the Chairperson post should also be included, as the provisions require simultaneous elections for the Chairperson and ward members. However, the respondents deny this. According to the respondents, the notification is only for ward members, as the alleged disturbances to filing nominations happened only at the ward level and do not involve the post of Chairperson.

43. Respondent No.1 specifically contends that it carefully assessed the situation and issued the extended notification accordingly. According to their assessment, no such incidents occurred in the other ULBs regarding nominations for Chairpersons. The extended notification does not refer to the other 96 ULBs. The Hon’ble Supreme Court directed Respondent No.1 to decide on the extension of time as required. If Respondent No.1, pursuant to the directions of the Hon’ble Supreme Court, decided after assessment that there were no incidents in the other ULBs, no incidents for the posts of Chairpersons, and not in all wards of the 4 ULBs, this decision-making process cannot be interpreted to extend the determined scope further, when the order of the Hon’ble Supreme Court is that, wherever it is required, on assessment, the respondent No. 1 has to take steps.

44. The original notification prescribed a time frame for the posts of chairpersons, which ended on 18.10.2026. According to respondent No.1, no incidents required consideration to extend the time for the posts of chairperson, for that matter, for all the ULBs. If the time is not

extended, the original notification continues to apply to the notified areas. Therefore, the time prescribed under the earlier notification for filing nominations for the post of Chairperson, which ended on 18.10.2026, was not extended.

45. The Hon’ble Supreme Court further directed that the respondents must file a compliance report before the Hon’ble Supreme Court on the next adjournment date, on compliance with the directions and the steps taken pursuant thereto. The matter is posted before the Hon’ble Supreme Court on 27.10.2026.

46. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that they are bound to file a compliance report before the Hon’ble Supreme Court. They maintain that only 4 ULBs received an extension of time for wards, after assessing the situations, and they will submit the report accordingly. He further submitted that, even otherwise, the present subject is pending and has been listed before the Hon’ble Supreme Court, and this Court cannot extend the time beyond the Hon’ble Supreme Court's directions.

47. The orders of the Hon’ble Supreme Court referred to above direct Respondent No.1 to consider the relevant material, take a decision, wherever it is of the view, that candidates could not file nominations due to law and order problems and that on such choosing places only, the respondent No.1 can extend the time not less than 48 hours and place the report. If Respondent No.1 has already taken the decision pursuant to the directions of the Hon’ble Supreme Court, identifying the areas and extended the time, the decision-making process or the decision taken by Respondent No.1 would be for consideration before the Hon’ble Supreme Court. This Court cannot go into the process of decision making or the decision taken by Respondent No.1, as it has taken a decision on the report for few areas and has to place a report of its decision and compliance before the Hon’ble Supreme Court. When the matter is pending before the Hon’ble Supreme Court, for the

compliance, this Court cannot go beyond the directions given to Respondent No.1, the State Election Commission, and pass any orders, as to mode of decision making or to extend its decision further to other areas.

48. Regarding learned Senior Counsel's submission that this Court has passed orders permitting the filing of nominations in W.P.(SR).No.30947 of 2026, it applies only where the period for filing nominations is extended and under due procedure of law.

49. The Hon'ble Supreme Court listed the matter for consideration of the compliance report on 27.10.2026. Accordingly, at this stage, this Court cannot pass any orders on the petitioner's prayer on this subject, going into the decision of the respondent No.1, which is the subject matter before the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

50. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submitted that the matter may be disposed of and not be posted beyond 27.10.2026. Hence, the writ petition is taken up.

Result:

51. In the result, the Writ Petition is hereby dismissed. No order as to costs.

Consequently, any pending interlocutory applications shall stand closed.

JUSTICE PURUSHOTTAM KUMAR CHINTALAPUDI

Dated: 24.10.2026
DSV

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE PURUSHOTTAM KUMAR CHINTALAPUDI

W.P.No.31132 of 2026

Dated: 24.10.2026.

DSV