

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

-

-

WRIT APPEAL No. 540 of 2015
AND
WRIT PETITION No.10883 of 2014

-

W.A.No.540 of 2015

Between:

Dr. N.T.R. University of Health Sciences,
Rep., by its Registrar, Vijayawada.

... Appellant

And

Dr. K. Ravi Naini
& others.

... Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: **24.07.2015**

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

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

-

- | | | |
|----|--|--------|
| 1. | Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see the judgments? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reporters/Journals? | Yes/No |
| 3. | Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the judgment? | Yes/No |

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

**WRIT APPEAL No. 540 OF 2015
AND
WRIT PETITION No.10883 of 2015**

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

Writ appeal is directed against an interim order passed on 01.05.2015 in W.P.No.10883 of 2015, whereby order, dated 31.03.2015, issued by the appellant University has been suspended.

By letter/order, dated 31.03.2015, the appellant-University had informed the College that admissions of seven candidates, including respondent No.1, were not approved. Respondent No.1 had taken admission into post-graduate course under management quota for MS (Ophthalmology) in July, 2014, for 2014-15.

Sri A. Prabhakar Rao, learned counsel appearing for the appellant, submits that in view of the letter dated 31.03.2015 respondent No.1 applied afresh for admission into post-graduate course in Ophthalmology and she got admission for the academic year 2015-16 and the same has already been approved by the University. He further submits that after admission and its approval, respondent No.1 has started attending the first year classes for the post-graduate course in Ophthalmology. This statement of learned counsel for the University has not been disputed by learned counsel for the 1st respondent.

In view thereof, when we expressed that this appeal as well as writ petition deserves to be disposed of as rendered infructuous, he agreed for the same.

Accordingly, the writ appeal as well as writ petition is disposed of as infructuous.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall also stand dismissed.

DILIP B. BHOSALE, ACJ

S.V. BHATT,

J

Date: 24.07.2015
ES