

The Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy

Writ Petition No.23064 of 2012

—
Dated 24.06.2015
—

Between:

M/s.Sandhya Electrical Works
rep. by its Proprietor
S.Narsing Rao

... Petitioner

and

The A.P.Central Power Distribution Co. Ltd.,
represented by its Chairman & Managing Director
Hyderabad and 3 others.

...Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner: Ms.Preeti Pawar for Mr.V.Hariharan

Counsel for the respondents: Mr.R.Vinod Reddy, SC for TSPDCL

The Court made the following:

Order:

At the interlocutory stage, the Writ Petition is taken up for hearing and disposal with the consent of the learned Counsel for the parties.

This Writ Petition is filed for the following substantive reliefs:

“to issue a writ, order or direction more

particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus declaring:-

- a. The Termination of Contract *vide* letter Lr. No. CGM /MP /Tech /Hyd /F.L.S.Agrmt /D.No.835 /11-12, dated 15.7.2011, as illegal, arbitrary and untenable and without notice and consequently, set aside the termination of contract by permitting the petitioner to continue and complete the contract; and
- b. Lr.No. CGM/MP/Gr. Hyd/E.S.p.38/10-11/D.No. 642/12, Dt. 23.06.2012, issued by the Respondent herein as illegal, arbitrary and violative of the principles of natural justice and offending Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently, set aside the same by directing to keep the petitioner on the empanelled list of Contractor.”

On 27-07-2012, Mr.V.Hariharan, learned Counsel for the petitioner, stated that his client is not pressing the relief in ‘clause a’ and sought for liberty to it to avail appropriate legal remedy. While placing this fact on record by its order, dated 27-07-2012, this Court has admitted the Writ Petition on 14-08-2012 and suspended the impugned proceeding to the extent of black listing the petitioner.

Today, at the hearing, Mr.R.Vinod Reddy, learned Standing Counsel for TSPDCL,

representing the respondents, submitted that, by the impugned order, the petitioner was blacklisted for three years; that the said period has expired by 22-06-2015; and that therefore, the cause in the Writ Petition does not survive for adjudication.

The above submission is not disputed by the learned Counsel for the petitioner.

In the light of the above facts, the Writ Petition is disposed of as infructuous without prejudice to the right of the petitioner to pursue the legal proceedings, if any initiated by it, questioning the termination of contract.

As a sequel to disposal of the Writ Petition, interim order, dated 14-08-2012, is vacated and WVMP.No.4472 of 2012 in/& WPMP.No.29451 of 2012 are disposed of as infructuous.

(C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy, J)

Dt: 24th June, 2015
LUR