

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

WRIT PETITION NO.31325 OF 2024

Between:

Tadisetti Tirupatamma

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

The State of Andhra Pradesh & Others

...Respondents

* * * * *

DATE OF ORDER PRONOUNCED : 03.09.2026

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K. SREENIVASA REDDY

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgment/Order? Yes/No
2. Whether the copy of Order may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? Yes/No
3. Whether His Lordship wish to see the
fair copy of the Judgment/Order? Yes/No

JUSTICE K.SREENIVASA REDDY

*** HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K.SREENIVASA REDDY**

+ WRIT PETITION NO.31325 OF 2024

% 03.09.2026

Between:

Tadisetti Tirupatamma

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

The State of Andhra Pradesh & Others

...Respondents

! Counsel for the Petitioner(s) : Ms. Shaik Shahedaz

^ Counsel for the Respondents :

1. Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj and Rural Development
2. Government Pleader for Revenue
3. Sri Hari Babu Maguluri, Standing Counsel for SERP
4. Mattegunta Sudhir, Standing Counsel for ZPPs, MPPs, Gram Panchayats

< Gist:

> Head Note:

? Cases referred:

1. Palla Gangamma v. State of Andhra Pradesh in Writ Petition No.18161 of 2022, dated 30.06.2022 on the file of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Nelapadu at Amaravati.
2. (2020) 5 ALT 261 : (2020) 6 ALD 552.
3. Surisetty Bharathamma v. The State of Andhra Pradesh and others in Writ Petition No.2529 of 2023, dated 11.04.2023 on the file of the High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Nelapadu at Amaravati.

This Court made the following:

Date on which Order/Judgment was reserved : 04.08.2026
 Date on which Order/Judgment was pronounced : 03.09.2026
 Date on which Order/Judgment was uploaded on the website of the High Court : 03.09.2026

APHC010599702024



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

[3327]

THURSDAY, THE 3rd DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K SREENIVASA REDDY

WRIT PETITION NO: 31325/2024

Between:

1. TADISETTI TIRUPATAMMA, W/O LATE HARIKRISHNA, AGED 38 YEARS, R/O KOTTAPALEM, UPPARAPALEM VILLAGE, PONNUR Mandal, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 522124.

...PETITIONER

A N D

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, PANCHAYAT RAJ AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATHI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
2. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, GVWV AND VSWs DEPARTMENT (GRAMA VOLUNTEERS WARD VOLUNTEERS AND VILLAGE SECRETARIAT DEPARTMENT) TADEPALLI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
3. THE SPECIAL COMMISSIONER, PANCHAYAT RAJ GVWV AND VSWs DEPARTMENT (GRAMA VOLUNTEERS WARD VOLUNTEERS AND VILLAGE SECRETARIAT DEPARTMENT) TADEPALLI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
4. THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, SERP SOCIETY FOR ELIMINATION OF RURAL POVERTY, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
5. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, GUNTUR DISTRICT, GUNTUR, ANDHRA PRADESH
6. THE PROJECT DIRECTOR, DRDA (DISTRICT RURAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY) GUNTUR, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
7. THE Mandal Parishad Development Officer, Mandal Praja PRAISHAD, PONNUR, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

...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 a writ or direction more particularly one in the nature of WRIT OF MANDAMUS declaring the action of the Respondents in not disposing the application of the Petitioners Pension Application No.PNS240316024685 dated 16.03.2024 for extending the scheme of NTR Bharosa Pension Scheme to the Petitioner in terms of G.O.Ms.No.43 Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department dated 13.06.2024 issued by the 1st Respondent in spite of the Petitioner being eligible on par with other similar and eligible beneficiaries and discriminating the Petitioner from other similarly placed beneficiaries on extraneous/political reasons as illegal, arbitrary, high handed, contrary to law, violative of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently to direct the Respondents to dispose of Petitioners Pension Application NO.PNS240316024685 dated 16.03.2024 forthwith extend the scheme of Pension under NTR Bharosa Pension Scheme to the Petitioner from the date of approval to till the date in terms of G.O.Ms.No.43 Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department dated 13.06.2024 and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2024

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 to direct the Respondents to dispose of Petitioner's Pension Application No.PNS240316024685 dated 16.03.2024 forthwith extend the scheme of Pension under NTR Bharosa Pension Scheme to the Petitioner from the date of approval to till the date in terms of G.O.Ms.No.43 Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department dated 13.06.2024 and 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 to grant leave to the petitioner herein/ Respondent No.6 in the Writ Petition No.31325 of 2024 to file counter affidavit 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 May be pleased to grant leave to the Petitioner/ respondent No.7 to file the counter affidavit and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. SHAIK SHAHEDAZ

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ RURAL DEV

2. GP FOR REVENUE

3. HARI BABU MAGULURI SC For SERP

4. Mattegunta Sudhir, Standing Counsel For Z.P.Ps, M.P.Ps,
Gram Panchayats

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE K. SREENIVASA REDDY**WRIT PETITION NO.31325 OF 2024****ORDER**

The present Writ Petition is filed seeking to following relief:

“... to issue Writ, Order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of respondents in not disposing the application of the petitioner’s Pension Application No.PNS240316024685 dated 16.03.2024 for extending the scheme of NTR Bharosa Pension Scheme to the petitioner in terms of G.O.Ms.No.43 Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 13.06.2024 issued by 1st respondent in spite of the petitioner being eligible on par with other similar and eligible beneficiaries, and discriminating the petitioner from other similarly placed beneficiaries on extraneous/political reasons, as illegal, arbitrary, high-handed, contrary to law and violative of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and consequently to direct the respondents to dispose of the petitioner’s Pension Application No.PNS240316024685 dated 16.03.2024 forthwith extend the scheme of Pension under NTR Bharosa Pension Scheme to the petitioner from the date of approval to till the date in terms of G.O.Ms.No.43 Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department date 13.06.2024, and to pass such other order or orders ...”

2. Contents of the affidavit, filed by the petitioner, in brief, are that, she, a resident of Ponnuru, contacted marriage with one Hari Krishna, who is a differently abled person (Physically Handicapped person); that the husband of the petitioner used to obtain pension vide ID No.10713359 till his death, on 14.07.2023,

due to illness; that subsequent to demise of petitioner's husband, the petitioner made an application on 16.03.2024 *vide* Application No.PNS240316024685 seeking Widow Pension issued in terms of YSR Pension Scheme.

(b) The erstwhile Government *vide* issued G.O.Ms.No.174 Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 13.12.2019 introduced Social Security Scheme under the title of YSR Pension Kanuka, and enhanced the pension amount of Old Age Pension, Widow Weavers, Toddy Tappers, Fishermen, Single Women, Traditional Cobblers and PLHIV (Art Pension) Categories, Disabled and Dialysis Pension; that subsequently, G.O.Ms.No.43 Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 13.06.2024, was issued by the present Government restoring the name of pension scheme as NTR Bharosa Pension Scheme by enhancing the pension amount from Rs.3,000/- to Rs.4,000/- per month, while maintaining the eligibility criteria as per previous scheme.

(c) The petitioner is eligible as per the conditions prescribed/laid for the beneficiaries enumerated in para (2) (b) of the G.O.Ms.No.174, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 13.12.2019; that the income of the petitioner's

family is less than Rs.10,000/- per month, and was having white ration card.

(d) Despite the petitioner being eligible, her application was kept pending before 7th respondent for more than 10 months, without approving; that the petitioner made several oral representations for resolving her issue, but it proved futile. One Suseela, resident of petitioner's neighbouring village, approached the respondents on 27.12.2022 to extend the Widow Welfare Scheme, and she was provided with new Pension ID No.10700139498 within 21 days of application *i.e.* on 31.01.2023 and pension was disbursed to her from 01.02.2023 onwards, which shows that the respondent authorities are showing preferential treatment to other people, and discrimination to the petitioner. Hence, it is prayed to dispose of the petitioner's application *vide* No.PNS240316024685, dated 16.03.2024 forthwith, and extend the said welfare scheme to the petitioner from the date of approval to till the date in terms of G.O.Ms.No.43, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 13.06.2024.

3. This Court, at the stage of admission, *vide* Order dated 08.01.2025 issued direction, which is extracted hereunder:

“...On perusal of the said instructions, it transpires that the Government is the sanctioning authority for granting widow pension.

Therefore, 5th respondent is directed to pass appropriate orders on the application No.PNS240314033445 dated 16.03.2024 and communicate the decision to the petitioner within a period of four (04) weeks from today.

List the matter after four (04) weeks.”

4. Again, when the matter has come up before this Court on 02.03.2026, it was represented by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was paid pension on 01.03.2026, but it was contended that she is eligible for the pension from April, 2024. It is evident from the said proceeding that Sri M.Hari Babu, learned Standing Counsel for 6th respondent submitted that though the petitioner is eligible for the pension, the same was stopped at later point of time, hence, he sought time for instructions regarding the arrears, if any, payable to the petitioner.

5. Respondent No.4 filed counter-affidavit denying the contents of the Writ-affidavit, *inter alia* contending that the relief sought by the petitioner had already been granted to her, and the pension is being disbursed to her regularly from February, 2026, and the claim for retrospective payment of pension is neither supported by any existing scheme or policy, nor it is within the purview of powers vested with 4th respondent. Therefore, the

petitioner has no vested legal right to claim pension from retrospective date, which is contrary to the established policy.

(b) The respondent No.4 complied the direction issued by this Court *vide* Order dated 08.01.2025 by processing the application as per the existing policy and within the ambit of the powers vested with 5th respondent; that the petitioner's husband *viz.* Tadisetty Harikrishna was sanctioned Pension under CKDU Private Pension Category with Pension ID No.1071132118 in July, 2023, and the first disbursement of the said pension was scheduled on 1st August, 2023, however, prior to that, he passed away on 14.07.2023.

(c) The petitioner made application for Widow Pension through online on 16.03.2024 *vide* Application No. PNS240316024685, but on the very same day *i.e.* on 16.03.2024, the Model Code of Conduct came into force in view of General Elections to the Lok Sabha and the Andhra Pradesh State Assembly, and the said Code was again in effect from 29.01.2025 for the MLC Biennial Election; that as the sanctioning of new pension is a matter of Government Policy, no new pension could be sanctioned during the period when the Model Code of Conduct was in operation; that the Code ended on 5th March, 2025, but the

Government had not sanctioned new pensions under the NTR Bharosa Pension Scheme through the Bi-Annual method, as this is a decision related to Government Policy.

(d) This scheme was implemented in a phased manner across the State, and the petitioner's husband was sanctioned pension, who passed away on 14.07.2023, the case of petitioner was correctly considered under the third instalment of the Spouse Pension Scheme, which covered the period from November, 2019 to November, 2023. The Mandal Parishad Development Officer, Ponnuru, being the competent authority for sanctioning the pension, duly processed the case and approved the sanction of widow pension to the petitioner under the Spouse Pension Category through online on 28.01.2026, and a new Pension ID No.10700200427 was generated and it would demonstrate the prompt and efficient discharge of duties by 5th respondent; that the petitioner was sanctioned Widow Pension at Rs.4,000/- per month with effect from February, 2026; that the Spouse Pension Scheme does not contain any provision for payment of arrears from the date of death of the petitioner's husband or from the date of application, therefore, the petitioner's claim for arrears from 16.03.2024 is

contrary to the policy and wholly untenable. Hence, it is prayed to dismiss the Writ Petition.

6. Respondent No.6 filed counter-affidavit, reiterating the contents of the counter-affidavit filed by respondent No.4, and prays the Court to dismiss the Writ Petition.

7. Respondent No.7 filed counter-affidavit, contending that the petitioner made application for sanction of Widow Pension on 16.03.2024, but it could not be processed due to enforcement of Model Code of Conduct in connection with General Elections, as no fresh social security pensions can be sanctioned by the Government of Andhra Pradesh. Later, pursuant to the Order dated 08.01.2025 passed by this Court, directing the respondent No.5, the petitioner's case was considered by the competent authority and widow pension was sanctioned, and accordingly, the petitioner has been receiving Widow Pension with effect from 01.03.2026. It is further submitted that the petitioner's claim for arrears of pension is concerned, 4th respondent is the competent authority in accordance with applicable Government Orders and Rules. Hence, it is prayed to pass appropriate order in the Writ Petition.

8. Heard both sides. Perused the entire material available on record.

9. Now the question that arises for consideration is whether the petitioner, having been found eligible for Widow Pension, is entitled to claim the benefit with retrospective effect?

10. Ms. Shaik Shahedaz, learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the husband of petitioner was differently abled person and he used to obtain pension *vide* ID No.10713359 till his death, on 14.07.2023, and as per the G.O.Ms.No.174, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 13.12.2019, the petitioner fulfilled the eligibility criteria and she is entitled to get Widow Pension under YSR Pension Scheme and accordingly, she made an application *vide* No.PNS240316024685. Learned counsel submits that subsequent to filing of the Writ Petition, as per the direction of this Court, the petitioner was paid pension on 01.03.2026, but it is contended that though the petitioner is entitled for arrears from April, 2024, she was not paid the same and showed discrimination to the petitioner.

11. Per contra, the learned Standing Counsel for the Society for Elimination of Rural Poverty (SERP) and the District Rural Development Agency (DRDA) representing the respondent Nos.4 and 6 would contend that the petitioner had already been granted pension and a new Pension ID No.10700200427 was

generated in her name, and an amount of Rs.4,000/- was being disbursed to her regularly from February, 2026. Learned counsel further contends that the Spouse Pension Scheme does not contain any provision for payment of arrears from the date of death of the petitioner's husband or from the date of application, therefore, the petitioner's claim for arrears from 16.03.2024 is contrary to the policy and wholly untenable, and she has no vested legal right to claim pension from retrospective date, which is contrary to the established policy.

12. Learned Standing Counsel for Mandal Praja Parishad and Gram Panchayat representing the respondent Nos.7 and 8 would contend that the application of petitioner, dated 16.03.2024 could not be processed due to coming into force of the Model Code of Conduct in connection with General Elections, but later, pursuant to the Order dated 08.01.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner's case was considered by the competent authority and widow pension was sanctioned, and accordingly, the petitioner has been receiving Widow Pension with effect from 01.03.2026. He further contends that the respondent No.4 is the competent authority to decide as to the claim of petitioner for arrears of pension in accordance with applicable Government Orders and Rules.

13. This Court in **Palla Gangamma v. State of Andhra Pradesh**¹ considered the very same social security pension framework and the instructions of the Government, prescribing a period of 21 days for processing the application. This Court observed that the Social Security Pension Scheme is intended to ameliorate the hardships of poor and vulnerable persons and to secure a dignified life under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. It was further observed that applications of eligible persons could not be kept pending contrary to the prescribed timeframe, and directed payment of pension from the date from which the benefit had been wrongly stopped.

14. In a similar set of case facts, in **Rajula Sahu v. Principal Secretary, Panchayat Raj, Government of Andhra Pradesh**² this Court held as under:

“For the reasons stated above, this Court is holding that stopping payment of social security pension to the petitioners without conducting any enquiry or without issuing any notice is illegal, arbitrary, discriminatory and against the object of society security pension scheme, against the principles of natural justice and violative of Article 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India.”

¹ Writ Petition No.18161 of 2022, dated 30.06.2022.

² (2020) 5 ALT 261 : (2020) 6 ALD 552.

The aforesaid decision of this Court, was subsequently affirmed by a Division Bench of this Court in Writ Appeal No.103 of 2021, dated 26.02.2021.

15. A perusal of the G.O.Ms.No.174, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 13.12.2019 goes to show that Comprehensive Revised Guidelines were issued regarding the eligibility criteria for sanction of pensions under the scheme of YSR Pension Kanuka, among which, 4th guideline reads as under:

4. Spouse Pension:

In the event of death of Old Age, Weaver, Fishermen, Toddy toppers, Disabled category pensioners, pension will be sanctioned to spouse (wife) to support the family. Pension amount will be released on par with Widow Category Pension.

16. The Government of Andhra Pradesh vide Memo No.1148399/RD.I/A1/2022, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 09.09.2022 issued revised operational guidelines on implementation of pension scheme under YSR Pension Kanuka Scheme. A perusal of the said Memo goes to show that it has been stated at Clause No.1.20 that the entire

process should be completed within 21 working days from the date of receipt of applications.

17. A perusal of the material on record goes to show that the husband of the petitioner died on 14.07.2023, and the petitioner made an application before the authority concerned on 16.03.2024 *vide* No.PNS240316024685 seeking Widow Pension Scheme in terms of YSR Pension Scheme. According to respondent authorities, due to coming into force of the Model Code of Conduct in connection with General Elections, the application of petitioner could not be processed, however, pursuant to the direction issued by this Court, the petitioner's case was considered by the competent authority and widow pension was sanctioned.

18. Therefore, it is evident that there is no dispute with regard to petitioner's eligibility, however, pursuant to the direction issued by this Court, the petitioner's application was processed and pension was sanctioned. Therefore, the very basis of respondents' case is not that the petitioner was ineligible, but it is that the sanction was delayed on account of administrative and policy decision. There is no dispute that the respondent authorities were required to comply with the directions of the Election Commission during the Model Code of Conduct, as it cannot be construed to

postponement of substantive entitlement of petitioner's entitlement, when she fulfils the eligibility conditions. Now, the question is as to whether the petitioner has vested legal right to claim the subject pension from retrospective date.

19. Indisputably, subsequent to General Elections to the Lok Sabha and the Andhra Pradesh State Assembly, the Government of Andhra Pradesh issued G.O.Ms.No.43, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 13.06.2024 restoring the pension scheme under the name of NTR Bharosa pension Scheme, and enhanced the pension amount from Rs.3,000/- to Rs.4,000/- to the subject category. Clause 2 (e) of the said GO reads as under:

2.(e) The enhanced pensions mentioned at

(a) *[Enhancement of existing pension amount from Rs.3,000/- month to Rs.4,000/- month for OAP, Widow, Weavers, Toddy Toppers, Fishermen, Single Women, Traditional Cobblers, Transgender, ART(PLHIV), Dappu Artists and pensions to Artists]* shall be payable from 1st April, 2024 disbursed from 1st July, 2024 along with 3 months arrears. Thus the amount to be disbursed under this category will be Rs.7,000/- in the month of July, 2024. Thereafter, Rs.4,000/- shall be disbursed every month.

20. Undeniably, the petitioner was paid pension on 01.03.2026. The contention of the petitioner is that she is eligible

for pension under the said Scheme from April, 2024. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that in a similar case of this nature in **Surisetty Bharathamma v. The State of Andhra Pradesh and others**³, this Court disposed of, the Writ Petition directing the respondents therein to release the pension in favour of the petitioner therein along with arrears as entitled.

21. In the case on hand, a perusal of the material on record goes to show that the petitioner's application was made on 16.03.2024, and the Government of Andhra Pradesh issued G.O.Ms.43, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 13.06.2024 restoring the pension. Clause 2 (e) of the G.O.Ms.No.43 specifically provides that the enhanced pension for categories including Widow Pension shall be payable from 01.04.2024 and shall be disbursed from 01.07.2024 along with three months' arrears. Therefore, the Government itself consciously fixed 01.04.2024 as the date for payment of the enhanced pension. Therefore, the respondent authorities cannot take advantage of their own failure to process the petitioner's application within the prescribed time and deprive her of the benefit.

³ Writ Petition No.2529 of 2023, dated 11.04.2023.

22. The contention of learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.4 that there is no express provision in the subject scheme directing payment of arrears from the date of application, for the reason that the petitioner is not claiming benefit for the period during which she was ineligible, but she is claiming benefit for the period during which her application remained pending consideration before the authorities concerned, despite her eligibility, and even the Government itself prescribed 21 working days' time for consideration of such application.

23. The petitioner, who made the application on 16.03.2024, had repeatedly approached the authorities for its process and when no action was taken, she knocked the doors of this Court, and the benefit of the scheme was extended to her in the year 2026, that to, when this Court directs the respondent authority *vide* Order dated 08.01.2025 to consider her application. Except merely assigning administrative reasons, it is not the case of the respondent authorities that the petitioner is not eligible for grant of pension or that she does not fulfil the eligibility criteria prescribed under the GOs. Therefore, the contention of respondents that the petitioner has no vested legal right to claim pension with retrospective, is untenable. Since the petitioner made

her application on 16.03.2024, she is otherwise eligible for Widow Pension, and any temporary restriction due to the Model Code of Conduct could not deny the accrued benefit for the subsequent period after the said Code is ceased.

24. Therefore, in view of the foregoing discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner is entitled to receive Widow Pension from the date of her application *i.e.* from 16.03.2024, subject to the eligibility conditions already found to be satisfied by her. The respondent authorities are directed to calculate and pay the arrears of pension from 16.03.2024 till the date from which regular monthly pension commenced, after giving due effect to the applicable rates under the G.O.Ms.No.174, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 13.12.2019 under the title of YSR Pension Kanuka, which was enhanced by G.O.Ms.No.43, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 13.06.2024, restoring the name of pension scheme as NTR Bharosa Pension Scheme.

25. It is made clear that the amount already paid to the petitioner towards pension shall be duly adjusted while calculating the arrears. The respondent authorities are directed to complete the entire process within a period of eight (08) weeks from the date

of receipt of copy of this order. It is also made clear that this Order shall not be construed as directing payment of pension to the persons who do not satisfy the eligibility criteria prescribed under the relevant Government Orders.

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

As a sequel, interlocutory applications pending, if any, in the Writ Petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE K. SREENIVASA REDDY

3rd September, 2026.

Note:

LR Copy to be marked.

B/o.
DNB