APHC010485342026

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

TUESDAY, THE 28th DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE KIRANMAYEE MANDAVA

WRIT PETITION NO: 26686 OF 2026

Between:

1. SRI VISHNU SRIRAM CONSTRUCTIONS, D.NO.4-1-735-1, 7TH STREET, ANJANEYANAGAR BADVEL, BADVEL MANDAL,YSR KADAPA DISTRICT REP BY ITS MANAGING PARTNER SRI V.DASARADHA RAMI REDDY, S/O. V RAMA MOHAN REDDY,

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.522238
2. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY, FINANCE DEPARTMENT,A.P. SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT. 522238
3. THE BADVEL MUNICIPALITY, REP BY ITS COMMISSIONER, BADVEL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT 515701
4. THE DEPUTY EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, BADVEL MUNICIPALITY,BADVEL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT 515701
5. THE ASSISTANT ENGINEER, BADVEL MUNICIPALITY,BAVEL, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT 515701
6. THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, PUBLIC HEALTH, QC DIVISION KADAPA, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT 517501
7. THE ENGINEER IN CHIEF PUBLIC HEALTH, TADEPALLI GUNTUR DISTRICT. 522503
8. THE PAY AND ACCOUNTS OFFICER, KADAPA, YSR KADAPA DISTRICT 517501

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. TRIPURAM RAVITEJA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP MUNCIPAL ADMN AND URBAN DEV AP
2. GP FOR FINANCE PLANNING

The Court made the following order:

Heard Sri Tripuram Raviteja, learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Municipal Administration and Urban Development, leaned Assistant Government Pleader for Finance Planning and Sri Gudapati Lakshminarayana, learned Standing Counsel for Municipalities appearing for the respondents.

2. The grievance of the petitioner in the instant Writ Petition is against the action of the respondents in not releasing the amount for the work executed by the petitioner, despite the completion of the work within the stipulated period.

3. It is contended that the petitioner is a contractor and was entrusted with the work of “Development of C.C. Roads Connecting the Isolated Habitations in Badvel Municipality (Package-XIII)” by the 2nd respondent pursuant to the agreement dated 21.06.2022. In pursuance thereof, the petitioner executed the work within the stipulated period. The work was duly inspected by the concerned Department, and certain deficiencies were communicated to the petitioner.

4. It is further contended that the petitioner submits that the 3rd respondent has failed to record the entire quantity of work executed by the petitioner and,

consequently, has not released the corresponding payment. The petitioner submits that a total length of CC road that was actually executed is 1,530 meters. However, the 3rd respondent measured only 1,230 meters of the work executed in the Measurement Book (M-Book) and released payment only to that extent. The petitioner further submits that the balance extent of 300 meters of CC road was also executed and checked by the concerned officials. However, the said quantity has neither been recorded in the M-Book nor has the corresponding amount been released to the petitioner. The petitioner submitted a representation dated 13.07.2026 before the 2nd respondent, requesting re-verification of the actual length of the road executed by the petitioner and release of the corresponding amount due to the petitioner and the same is not yet been considered. Thus, the petitioner approached this Court by way of instant Writ Petition.

5. Today, when the matter is taken up for consideration, Sri Gudapati Lakshminarayana, learned Standing Counsel for Municipalities has placed before the Court a copy of the written instructions dated 28.09.2026 received from the 3rd respondent. A perusal of the same would reflect that the petitioner has failed to complete the works entrusted to him. Therefore, the amounts corresponding to the unexecuted works have not been permitted for payment.

6. In this regard, it is argued that the final bill, along with the withheld amount, can be processed and released only upon completion of the works entrusted to the petitioner, subject to due verification and compliance with the terms and conditions of the agreement. The EMD and FSD, as applicable, are

liable to be released in accordance with the contractual conditions and upon fulfilment of the prescribed requirements, after completion of the works.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner brought to the notice of the respondents that, despite completion of the works entrusted to him, the respondents did not conduct the re-verification, and the same was not recorded in the M-Book. He, therefore, prays for a direction to the respondents to consider and pass appropriate orders on the representation dated 13.07.2026 submitted by the petitioner.

8. Considered the submissions.

9. Having regard to the above, as a detailed representation was submitted by the petitioner for redressal of his grievance, for re-verification of the actual execution of the works, and recording of the same in the M-Book, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition, in the interests of justice, with a direction to the respondents to consider and pass appropriate orders on the representation dated 13.07.2026 submitted by the petitioner, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

10. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE KIRANMAYEE MANDAVA

Date: 28.09.2026
BSK

98

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE KIRANMAYEE MANDAVA

WRIT PETITION NO: 26686 OF 2026

Date: 28.09.2026
BSK