



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

[3483]

WP(PIL) NO: 22/2025

Between:

Mallavarapu Lakshmana Kumar

...PETITIONER

AND

Union Of India and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.GUNDALA SIVA PRASADA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

- 1.GP FOR HOME
- 2.GP FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATION
- 3.GP FOR COMMERCIAL TAX
- 4.
- 5.GP FOR LAW LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

**CORAM: THE CHIEF JUSTICE DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR
SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI**

DATE: .03.2025

ORDER: (Per Sri Justice Ravi Cheemalapati)

This writ petition in the nature of the Public Interest Litigation has been filed for following relief:

“...declaring the action of the respondents enhancing the ticketing price and telecast of number of shows per day of 14 to 18th respondent Super High Budget Films “Sankranthiki Vasthunam” violating the orders of this court in W.P.No.7094 of 2022 dated 20.04.2022 and quidproquo of production cost of more than Rs.100 crores is illegal, arbitrary, unjust, improper against principles of Natural Justice and (i) Direct the respondents more particularly 5th respondent to revise the ticket price of

14th to 18th respondent Super High Budget Films “Sankranthiki Vasthunam” as per G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022 and recover the excess amounts to state exchequer (ii) Direct the 13th respondent to make a proper inquiry/investigation against 14 to 18th respondents Super High Budget Films “Sankranthiki Vasthunam” of quidproquo of production cost of more than Rs.100 crores (iii) Direct the respondents to import a proper inquiry against 14 to 19th respondents for their hype in promoting their film named “Sankranthiki Vasthunam” and pass..”

2. Heard Sri G.Siva Prasad Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms S.Pranathi, learned Special Government Pleader for Respondents.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner in elaboration to what has been stated in the affidavit, would contend that, the respondents have issued a memo dated 08.01.2025 for enhancing the ticket rates of the movie/film named “Sankranthiki Vasthunam” and further given permission to screen six(06) shows on 14.01.2025 and to screen five(05) shows from 15.01.2025 to 23.01.2025 with an additional amount of Rs.125/- (including GST) for Multiplex and Rs.100/- (including GST) for single theatres on the existing (prevailing) rates, contrary to G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022. He would further contend that, in G.O.Ms.No.13 dated 07.03.2022, at para 3, for Rates of Admission into theatres wherein a fixed rate per show was issued in different areas with different nature of theatres but in the memo issued by the 5th respondent, there was no specific rate for each category of show and altogether a fixed rate was confined which violates the said G.O. In fact, this Court in W.P.No.7094 of 2022, granted interim stay for implementation of the G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022 and the same is still in force. In such an event, issuance of the

memo dated 08.01.2025 by the 5th respondent, whereby enhancing the ticket prices is illegal, unsustainable and would curtail the rights guaranteed under the Constitution.

4. On the other hand, Ms S.Pranathi, Special Government Pleader for Respondents submitted that the Government is proposing to modify the G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022 and the same is under consideration. She further contended that, in fact, the said G.O. was questioned by one Multiplex Association of India Federation House in W.P.No.7094 of 2022, which is pending adjudication before this Court. Further, the petitioner has not made out any case in the present Public Interest Litigation (PIL) and the same is filed for oblique motives and for oblique consideration and the same deserves dismissal.

5. It is evident that questioning the G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022, a writ petition vide W.P.No.7094 of 2022 was filed before this Court, which is pending adjudication wherein an interim stay was granted by this Court and the same is still in force. In spite of the said interim stay, the respondents have enhanced the ticket prices for the film named "Sankranthiki Vastunam" by issuing a memo dated 08.01.2025, is the stand of the petitioner in the present PIL. As it could be seen, the interim stay order passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.7094 of 2022 is with regard to online service charges, which is not the issue in the case on hand.

6. Further, in the memo issued by the 5th respondent dated 08.01.2025, the six(06) shows were scheduled on 14.01.2025 and five(05) shows were scheduled from 15.01.2025 to 23.01.2025. By the time this point fell for consideration, the said shows have already been telecast, which serves no purpose in dealing with the said aspect. Moreover, in view of the stand taken by the Government that they are proposing to modify the G.O.Ms.No.13 Home (General-A) Department dated 07.03.2022, this Court is of the opinion that this petition has been, in fact, filed not on account of the interest of the public but only for purposes of getting publicity.

7. In so far as the investigation with regard to production cost of the movie/film is concerned, it is not viable in the writ Court to order the initiation of an investigation. That function clearly lies in the domain of the executive and it is up to the investigating agencies themselves to decide whether the material produced before them provides a sufficient basis to launch an investigation. In the said circumstances, directing the Enforcement Directorate to investigate, in our view, is again a abuse of the process of the Court, as the petition is short of wild and sweeping allegations and there is nothing placed before the Court which in any way may be called to be prima facie evidence. The petitioner, thus, is attempting to seek a roving probe monitored by this Court into suspicions so entertained by the petitioners based on nothing but bald allegations. This is thus, certainly not a case warranting the exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution.

8. Be that as it may, considering the fact that there is no point in dealing with the aspect of enhancing the ticket prices for the film named “Sankranthiki Vastunam”, as the scheduled shows have already been telecast, this Public Interest Litigation (PIL) is liable to be dismissed.

Accordingly, the Public Interest Litigation is ***dismissed***. There shall be no orders as to costs.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR,J

RAVI CHEEMALAPATI,J

BRS