

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA
REDDY**

WRIT PETITION No.41612 of 2015

-
22.12.2015

Between:

Kothalanka Kameswara Rao

.. Petitioner

and

The State of Andhra Pradesh,
represented by its Principal Secretary,
Revenue (Endowments) Department,
Hyderabad and others

.. Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner: Mr.N.Siva Reddy

Counsel for respondent Nos.1 to 3: Assistant Government Pleader
for Endowments (AP)

Counsel for respondent No.4: --

-
The Court made the following:

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

-

ORDER:

The petitioner, who is the *Archaka* of Sri Chandrasekhara Swamyvari temple, Jaggampeta Village and Mandal, East Godavari District, filed this writ petition feeling aggrieved by the proceedings, dated 13.08.2015, of respondent No.2, whereunder he has kept respondent No.4 in additional charge of two temples including the temple in question. The proceedings also directed the petitioner to handover complete charge of the accounts and records regarding the temple in question to respondent No.4.

Mr.N.Siva Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner, has urged that on 06.01.2009, respondent No.2 has withdrawn the executive officer/manager of the temple in question and authorized the petitioner to lookafter its affairs and that therefore, without cancelling the previous proceedings, respondent No.4 ought not to have been kept incharge of the accounts and records of the temple in question.

Mrs.K.Lalitha, learned standing counsel for Endowments (AP) appearing for the temple in question, submitted that under the proceedings, dated 06.01.2009, the petitioner was authorized to lookafter the affairs of the temple in question until further orders and that therefore, respondent No.2 is entitled to pass a further order, which he has done by way of the impugned proceedings.

A perusal of the proceedings, dated 06.01.2009, of respondent No.2 shows that while withdrawing the executive officer/manager of the temple in question, the petitioner was authorized to lookafter the affairs of the temple in question “until further orders”. Therefore, as rightly pointed out by the learned standing counsel, the said proceedings will cease to remain in force, once a fresh order is passed and that the impugned proceedings constitute the “further orders” as referred in proceedings, dated 06.01.2009. Moreover, an *Archaka* has no vested right to manage a temple on administrative side. Therefore,

none of the petitioner's legally enforceable rights has been infringed by the impugned proceedings.

Hence, the Writ Petition is dismissed as having no merit.

As a sequel to dismissed of the Writ Petition, W.P.M.P.No.53710 of 2015 filed by the petitioner for interim relief shall stand dismissed as infructuous.

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

22nd December, 2015
GHN