

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA
PRADESH

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE DILIP B. BHOSALE
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION No.123 OF 2015

DATED: 22.06.2015

Between:

Amaram Jaipal Reddy

... Petitioner

and

The State of Telangana and others

... Respondents

**THE HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE DILIP B. BHOSALE
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION No.123 of 2015

-
-

PC: (per the Hon'ble Sri Justice S.V.Bhatt)

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. T. Sudhakar Reddy, learned Standing Counsel appearing for fourth and sixth respondents.

The petitioner complains against the inaction of respondents 2 to 6 in disposing of representation, dated 16.05.2015 as illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional. The petitioner in terms of the Gram Panchayat resolution, dated 14.02.2015, prays for a direction that the respondents are restrained from making or executing Godavari Drinking Water Supply Project in the midst of houses or through Gundla Pochampally. From the prayer it is evident, the grievance of the petitioner is two-fold a) inaction in disposing of representation, dated 16.05.2015 and b) the respondents are directed not to lay the pipeline of Water Supply Project through houses in Gundla Pochampally or Gundle Pochampally.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner contends that the Gram Panchayat of Gundla Pochampally has passed a resolution dated 14.02.2015 to the effect that the

water supply pipeline shall not be laid through Gundla Pochampally as the execution of project affects the existing houses in the village. The learned counsel has drawn our attention to the plan, which is marked as Ex.P.3, to show the alignment of water supply line at Gundla Pochampally being implemented by respondents 6 and 7. According to him, the alignment of the pipeline ought not to be passing through Village and if the alternative route suggested by the petitioner is accepted, the cost of project will come down considerably and the drainage lines in the Village remain unaffected. Hence, the writ.

The learned Standing Counsel on instructions has placed before us the layout or alignment of the subject plan as executed at Gundla Pochampally Village. According to the learned Standing Counsel, the petition is filed on clear misapprehension namely that alignment of pipeline is likely to affect the houses or drainage pipes laid by the Gram Panchayat. According to him, the work is executed after obtaining permissions from all the authorities and as a result of fact, the pipeline is passing through the road in Gundla Pochampally, but not through houses. According to him, all permissions are obtained and no house is being affected in the execution of the subject drinking water supply project.

We have considered the submission of learned counsel for parties and perused the material available on record.

Prima facie, we are not satisfied that the petitioner has locus to challenge the laying of the pipeline or complain against inaction in disposing of the representation. The

material placed by the learned Standing Counsel shows that all permissions are obtained prior to execution of the pipeline and the conditions imposed in the permission take care of eventualities if any. We are satisfied that no cause is made out by petitioner.

Writ petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

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

DILIP B. BHOSALE, ACJ

22nd JUNE, 2015.

S.V. BHATT, J

kvni