

**WP(PIL) NO: 169 of 2025**

Yemu Kondal Rao

...Petitioner

Vs.

The State Of AP and Others

...Respondent(s)

Advocate for Petitioner:

Mr. Jada Sravan Kumar

Advocate for Respondent:

Smt. S. Pranathi, Spcl. Govt. Pleader

**CORAM : THE CHIEF JUSTICE DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR
SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI****DATE : 10th September 2025****P C :**

The present petition has been filed challenging the display of the pictures and portraits of the Deputy Chief Minister in the offices across the State of Andhra Pradesh on the ground that the said action is arbitrary and violates the principles enshrined under Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

The petitioner states that the present PIL has been filed to safeguard public interest.

2. We fail to understand as to how the display of a portrait or a picture in a Government office of a Deputy Chief Minister would in any manner affect any of the rights of a citizen under the Constitution in the absence of any specific

statutory prohibition on such display. The petition is clearly filed with a political motive.

3. In **Dattaraj Nathuji Thaware v. State of Maharashtra**¹, the Apex Court held as under:

“4. ...Public interest litigation which has now come to occupy an important field in the administration of law should not be “publicity interest litigation” or “private interest litigation” or “politics interest litigation” or the latest trend “paise income litigation”. The High Court has found that the case at hand belongs to the last category. If not properly regulated and abuse averted, it becomes also a tool in unscrupulous hands to release vendetta and wreak vengeance, as well. There must be real and genuine public interest involved in the litigation and not merely an adventure of a knight errant borne out of wishful thinking. It cannot also be invoked by a person or a body of persons to further his or their personal causes or satisfy his or their personal grudge and enmity. Courts of justice should not be allowed to be polluted by unscrupulous litigants by resorting to the extraordinary jurisdiction. A person acting bona fide and having sufficient interest in the proceeding of public interest litigation will alone have a locus standi and can approach the court to wipe out violation of fundamental rights and genuine infraction of statutory provisions, but not for personal gain or private profit or political motive or any oblique consideration. ...

12. Public interest litigation is a weapon which has to be used with great care and circumspection and the judiciary has to be extremely careful to see that behind the beautiful veil of public interest, an ugly private malice, vested interest and/or publicity-seeking is not lurking. It is to be used as an effective weapon in the armoury of law for delivering social justice to citizens. The attractive brand name of public interest litigation should not be used for suspicious products of mischief. It should be aimed at redressal of genuine public wrong or public injury and not be publicity-oriented or founded on personal vendetta. As indicated above, court must be careful to see that a body of persons or member of the public, who approaches the court is acting bona fide and not for personal gain or private motive or political motivation or other oblique considerations. The court must not allow its process to be abused for oblique considerations by masked phantoms who monitor at times from behind. Some persons with vested interest indulge in the pastime of meddling with judicial process either by force of habit or from improper motives, and try to bargain for a good deal as well as to enrich themselves. Often they are actuated by a desire to win notoriety or cheap popularity. The petitions of such busybodies deserve to be thrown out by rejection at the threshold, and in appropriate cases with exemplary costs.”

¹ (2005) 1 SCC 590

4. The Apex Court in **State of Uttaranchal v. Balwant Singh Chaufal**², held as under:

“181. ...We have also examined the law declared by this Court and other courts in a number of judgments. In order to preserve the purity and sanctity of the PIL, it has become imperative to issue the following directions:

(1) The Courts must encourage genuine and bona fide PIL and effectively discourage and curb the PIL filed for extraneous considerations.

(2) Instead of every individual Judge devising his own procedure for dealing with the public interest litigation, it would be appropriate for each High Court to properly formulate rules for encouraging the genuine PIL and discouraging the PIL filed with oblique motives. Consequently, we request that the High Courts who have not yet framed the rules, should frame the rules within three months. The Registrar General of each High Court is directed to ensure that a copy of the rules prepared by the High Court is sent to the Secretary General of this Court immediately thereafter.

(3) The Courts should prima facie verify the credentials of the petitioner before entertaining a PIL.

(4) The Courts should be prima facie satisfied regarding the correctness of the contents of the petition before entertaining a PIL.

(5) The Courts should be fully satisfied that substantial public interest is involved before entertaining the petition.

(6) The Courts should ensure that the petition which involves larger public interest, gravity and urgency must be given priority over other petitions.

(7) The Courts before entertaining the PIL should ensure that the PIL is aimed at redressal of genuine public harm or public injury. The Court should also ensure that there is no personal gain, private motive or oblique motive behind filing the public interest litigation.

(8) The Courts should also ensure that the petitions filed by busybodies for extraneous and ulterior motives must be discouraged by imposing exemplary costs or by adopting similar novel methods to curb frivolous petitions and the petitions filed for extraneous considerations.”

² (2010) 3 SCC 402

5. Considering the facts of the present case on the touchstone of the law discussed hereinabove, we are of the opinion that the present petition is clearly politically motivated and the same is, accordingly, dismissed. No costs.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR, CJ

RAVI CHEEMALAPATI, J

akn

**HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR, CHIEF JUSTICE
&
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI**

Writ Petition (PIL) No: 169 of 2025

DATE : 10.09.2025

AKN