

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION No.582 OF 2015

BETWEEN

Mother Teresa's Children Future Film Society of Kalwakurthy, Mahaboob
Nagar District, rep. by its President.

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary (Department of
Home), A.P. Secretariat Building, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

The Court made the following:

-
-

ORDER:

Heard.

2. Petitioner-Society is stated to be working for Child welfare and Education. It is also stated that petitioner-society has been organizing film festivals and screening of movies for the children on the subjects of General Knowledge, Social Elements, Science and Technology, Animals and History etc., for better education of children and their development. Petitioner also states that it was granted permission by the Collector, Ranga Reddy, for exhibiting children's films in the local theatres in Ranga Reddy District for the

period from September, 2014 to February, 2015 vide proceedings of the Collector, Ranga Reddy, dated 05.11.2014. Based on that, petitioner had approached the District Educational Officer, Ranga Reddy, who also granted similar proceedings directing the Mandal Educational Officers to take necessary steps vide orders of District Educational Officer, dated 14.11.2014. Petitioner also approached the Commissioner of Police, Cyberabad, for permission to screen the movies, which was accordingly accorded by the Commissioner on 14.11.2014. Based on the said permission, petitioner states that he has booked several theatres and have made all arrangements for taking up screening of the films and while the screening was scheduled to start from 20.01.2015, petitioner was surprised to receive the impugned proceedings issued by the Commissioner of Police, dated 05.12.2014 altering the permission earlier granted to the petitioner on the rival claims stated to have been made by respondent No.3. Aggrieved thereby, the present writ petition is filed and one of the contentions raised in the writ petition is that the petitioner was not even notified or heard by respondent No.2 before altering the schedule approved in the permission earlier granted to the petitioner.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader.

4. Keeping in view that the petitioner-Society has allegedly made all arrangements for screening of the films and that pendency of this writ petition would substantially delay the entire programme envisaged, in my view, petitioner's contention with regard to the violation of principles of natural justice is clearly sustainable inasmuch as the impugned order modifying the earlier permission granted to the petitioner is passed obviously without hearing the petitioner. Hence, it is necessary for respondent No.2 to notify the petitioner as well as respondent No.3, hear them and then pass an appropriate order,

as the facts and circumstances of the case warrant. The Commissioner of Police shall, therefore, review the impugned order, and pass appropriate fresh order after hearing both the sides, as directed above. In order to save inconvenience to any of the parties,

it would be appropriate to direct the Commissioner of Police to hear and

decide the matter, as directed, on or before 24.01.2015.

With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

January 21, 2015

Note:-

Furnish copy by today.

{B/o} LMV