APHC010585572026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3458]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE 12th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE KIRANMAYEE MANDAVA

WRIT PETITION NO: 32076/2026

Between:

1. VADDE VENKATA RAMUDU, S/O. VADDE EERANNA, AGED ABOUT 44 YEARS, R/O. D.NO. 9-115, BANAGANAPALLI, NANDYALA DISTRICT - 518124.
2. NALLAVUKKALA NAVEEN,, S/O. N. RAMACHANDRUDU, AGED ABOUT 24 YEARS, R/O. 16-162, RAMBHUPAL NAGAR, BHANUMUKKALA, BANAGANAPALLI, NANDYALA DISTRICT - 518124.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, PANCHAYAT RAJ AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT - 522238.
2. THE COMMISSIONER PANCHAYAT RAJ, OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF PANCHAYAT RAJ, TADEPALLI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 522501.
3. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR AND DISTRICT ELECTION OFFICER, NANDYALA DISTRICT, COLLECTORATE, NANDYALA TOWN AND DISTRICT - 518502.
4. THE REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, BANAGANAPALLI DIVISION,

BANAGANAPALLI, NANDYALA DISTRICT - 518124.

5. THE MANDAL PARISHAD DEVELOPMENT OFFICER MPDO, MANDAL PRAJA PARISHAD, BANAGANAPALLI MANDAL, BANAGANAPALLI, NANDYALA DISTRICT - 518124.

6. THE BANAGANAPALLI GRAM PANCHAYAT, REPRESENTED BY ITS PANCHAYAT SECRETARY, BANAGANAPALLI, NANDYALA DISTRICT - 518124.

7. THE APPALAPURAM GRAM PANCHAYAT, REPRESENTED BY ITS PANCHAYAT SECRETARY, BANAGANAPALLI MANDAL, NANDYALA DISTRICT - 518124.

8. THE STATE ELECTION COMMISSION, VIJAYAWADA, NTR DISTRICT, REPRESENTED BY ITS STATE ELECTION COMMISSIONER, NEW HOD'S BUILDING, OPPOSITE INDIRA GANDHI MUNICIPAL STADIUM, M.G. ROAD, VIJAYAWADA - 520010.

...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 toissue a Writ, Order or Direction more particularly one in the nature of a Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in not reserving the office of Sarpanch of Banaganapalli Gram Panchayat, Banaganapalli Mandal, Nandyala District for the Backward Classes, and in retaining the same as Un-Reserved, in the Second Ordinary Elections to Gram Panchayats, 2026, without applying the mandatory rule of rotation and the descending order of the proportion of Backward Class voters, as published in the Nandyala District Gazette (Extraordinary) No. 55 dated 14.10.2026 vide Rc. No. 1917/Pts.A2/2026, as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Rules 8(3) and 9(1) of the Andhra Pradesh Panchayat Raj (Reservation of Seats and Offices of Gram Panchayats, Mandal Praja Parishads and Zilla Praja Parishads) Rules, 2026 issued in G.O.Ms.No.154, PR RD (E R) Department, dated 12.10.2026, Section 15 of the Andhra Pradesh 5 Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 and Articles 14 and 243-D of the Constitution of India b. consequently set aside the said reservation insofar as it relates to the allotment of the offices of Sarpanch reserved for the Backward Classes in Banaganapalli Mandal c. direct the Respondents No. 3 and 4 to re-allot the

said offices strictly in accordance with Rules 8(3), 8(4) and 9(1) of the said Rules by reserving the office of Sarpanch of Banaganapalli Gram Panchayat for the Backward Classes, and to notify the same before the issuance of the election notification for the said Gram Panchayat and d. 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 suspend the Nandyala District Gazette (Extraordinary) No. 55 dated 14.10.2026 vide Rc. No. 1917/Pts.A2/2026 to the extent the same notifies the reservation to the Banaganapalli Grama Panchayat during the pendency of the present 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 pleased to direct the Respondents herein to maintain status quo / not to issue any election notification in respect of the Banaganapalli Grama Panchayat until the reservation for Banaganapalli Grama Panchayat is rectified / allotted to backward classed in accordance with Rules 8(3) and 9(1) of the Andhra Pradesh Panchayat Raj (Reservation of Seats and Offices of Gram Panchayats, Mandal Praja Parishads and Zilla Praja Parishads) Rules, 2026, and pas

IA NO: 3 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 implead the Petitioner herein/ proposed Respondent No. 9 as the Respondent no. 9 in W.P. No. 32076 of 2026 and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. VARUN BYREDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

2. SASANKA BHUVANAGIRI (SC FOR NON SERVICES ZPPS MPPS GP FOR RAYALASEEMA SPSR NELLORE PRAKASAM)

3. N ASHWANI KUMAR

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE KIRANMAYEE MANDAVA

WRIT PETITION NO: 32076/2026

ORDER:-

Heard Sri Varun Byreddy, learned counsel for the petitioners, learned Senior Counsel Sri K.S. Murthy, appearing for Ms. Aishwarya Nagula, learned counsel for respondent No.9, Sri N. Ashwani Kumar, learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondent No.8, and learned Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj and Rural Development, appearing for respondent Nos.1 & 2.

2. The present writ petition is filed challenging the action of the respondents in not reserving the office of Sarpanch of Banaganapalli Gram Panchayat, Banaganapalli Mandal, Nandyala District, in favour of the Backward Classes, and in retaining the same as Unreserved, in the Second Ordinary Elections to Gram Panchayats, 2026, without following the mandatory rule of rotation and the descending order of the proportion of Backward Class voters, as published in the Nandyala District Gazette (Extraordinary) No.55, dated 14.10.2026.

3. Aggrieved by the respondents' failure to reserve the office of Sarpanch Bangana Palli Gram Panchayat for the Backward Classes community in the 2nd Ordinary elections to the Gram Panchayat, the instant writ petition has

been filed. It is contended that without applying the rule of rotation and not maintaining the order of descending proportion of backward class voters, the reservation has been fixed, retaining the subject village as unreserved in the Gazette Notification No. 55 dated 14.10.2026. The petitioner contends that he belongs to the B.C-A community and the 2nd petitioner belongs to the B.C- B community, and they intend to contest for the office of Sarpanch of the Grama Panchayath. On account of the Grampanchayat being classified as unreserved, the petitioners have approached this Court. The petitioner contends that the reservation of seats in Grampanchayats for Backward classes should be determined proportionately to the number of B.C voters. The petitioner contends that out of the 7 offices of Sarpanchs reserved for backward class communities, the subject village is standing at serial number 4 as per the percentage of the voters; however, the same has been overlooked and granted to another Gram Panchayat, namely Appalapuram, which is at serial number 7, with a percentage of BC voters at 46.72%, which is less than the subject village's percentage of BC voters at 66.14%.

4. The learned Government Pleader, appearing for the Respondents placing reliance on the statement (Annexure-VI)showing the Gram Panchayat-wise BC Voters as on 3-9-2026 in descending order, contends that the petitioner village is standing at Serial No.14 with a percentage of voters at 55.851%, which is lower than the BC voter percentage in respect of a

Appalapuram Grampanchayat. Therefore, the petitioner village cannot be considered for reservation in favour of backward classes, as it is incumbent on the officer to follow the reservation based on the voter strength of a Gram Panchayat in descending order as well as the rotation policy.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners further places reliance on Ex.P4 and the BC population figures reflected therein. He further submits that the BC population figures placed before this Court by the learned Government Pleader, in Annexure-VI, contain discrepancies with regard to the number of voters. According to the learned counsel, the said discrepancy has made all the difference in the allotment of reservation to Appalapuram Gram Panchayat.

6. The learned Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj and Rural Development, appearing for the respondents, has placed before this Court instructions received by him in the said regard explaining the discrepancy and its rectification. In the said regard it is stated that during the initial preparation of the preliminary B. C voters list, due to time constraints in collecting and verifying community particulars, certain voters belonging to the Syeds, Pakirs and Pathan communities were inadvertently included in the B. C category. Subsequently, on receipt of objections, during the verification process, the same were verified, and it was found that the individuals belonging to those communities were required to be classified under the *open category* and not

under the B. C category. Accordingly, the respective names were deleted from the B. C classification and moved to the other category in the final community-wise classification list. Similarly, Setti Balija Community was added to Balija Community under the B.C category. In subsequent verification of the community-wise particulars, the said discrepancy was identified and accordingly rectified by deleting the Setti Balija Community from the Balija Community.

7. Considered the submissions. This Court is of the view that the reservation of Sarpanch offices is a statutory exercise, and the competent authorities must determine the allocation by applying the criteria prescribed under the Rules. Having regard to the voter percentage criteria and rotation policy, Appalapuram Gram Panchayat has been reserved for the BC category in accordance with governing procedure as contemplated under G.O.Ms.No.154 dated 12-10-20206. The allocation of B. C reservation to Appalapuram village was assessed with reference to the eligible Gram panchayats in the Mandal as a whole, their comparative B.C voter percentages, and the previous reservation. In the said process the BC voter percentage, as reflected from the Annexure-VI, the Appalapuram Grampanchayat is taking precedence over Baganapalli Grampanchayat. Therefore this court is of the view that when the allocation of reservation has been issued after following the procedure provided under the applicable

Rules, the individual grievance cannot by itself would constitute a legal ground to disturb the reservation granted after following the procedure. And the alleged discrepancy between in the percentages figures relied upon by the petitioner and those furnished by the respondents has been clearly explained by the respondents.

8. In the light of the foregoing the writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

_____

JUSTICE KIRANMAYEE MANDAVA

Dated:12.11.2026

MVK

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE KIRANMAYEE MANDAVA

WRIT PETITION NO:32076 of 2026

Dated:12.11.2026

MVK