

HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE DILIP B. BHOSALE

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION No.213 of 2015

Dt:10.08.2015

Between:

Abdul Ghani.

... Petitioner

And

The Principal Secretary and others.

... Respondents

HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE DILIP B. BHOSALE

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION No.213 of 2015

PC: (per the Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice Dilip B. Bhosale)

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

In the instant PIL, the petitioner seeks the following relief:

“It is therefore prayed that this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue a writ order or direction, more particularly one in nature of a Writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction of the respondents in compliance of the Hon’ble High Court directions passed in W.P.No.436 of 2010 dated 20.01.2010 and W.P.No.156 of 2013 dated 08.04.2013, respectively and proceedings with the re-organize the villages by not including the Kothapet Village in Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation (GHMC) in the proposed inclusion of several other villages, which are situated at a farther distances than Kothapet Village from the existing limits of GHMC and consequently direct the respondents to include the Kothapet Village in the Greater Hyderabad Municipal Corporation (GHMC) in proposed inclusion of villages in GHMC, and pass such other order or orders as this Hon’ble Court deems fit and proper in the circumstances of this case in the interest of justice.”

It appears that one Selveri Santaiah had filed PIL No.156 of 2013 before this Court for similar relief and this Court had disposed of the PIL *vide* its order, dated 08.04.2013, directing the respondents therein, who are also respondents in the instant PIL, to consider the petitioner’s representations, dated 26.10.2010, 15.06.2010 and 12.09.2012 on merits. The petitioner, in the instant PIL, has not made any efforts to find out whether the representations of the petitioner were considered or what is the outcome of those representations.

Though across the Bar, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the representations are not considered till this date, he is not in a position to point out any such statement made on affidavit filed by him in support of the PIL nor has he produced any other material in support of his contention.

Keeping that in view, we do not find any reason to entertain the instant PIL for similar relief as sought in the earlier PIL.

Hence, the PIL is dismissed.

Consequently, miscellaneous petitions, if any, also stand disposed of.

DILIP B. BHOSALE, ACJ

S.V. BHATT, J

Dt:10.08.2015

kdl