

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

WRIT PETITION NO.23284 of 2015

Between :

Punreddy Narendra Reddy S/o.Late Mohan Reddy,
Age 60 yrs, Occu : Agriculture,
R/o.Chinthapally village and Mandal,
Nalgonda District.

.. Petitioner

and

The State of Telangana,
Rep., by its Chief Secretary,
Secretariat, Hyderabad & others

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED : 11.08.2015

-
SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-
-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

-
-
-

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers : Yes / No
may be allowed to see the Judgments ?

2. Whether the copies of judgment may be : Yes / No
marked to Law Reporters/Journals

3. Whether Their Lordship wish to : Yes / No
see the fair copy of the Judgment ?

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

-

WRIT PETITION No.23284 of 2015

ORDER :

The grievance of the petitioner in the writ petition is that a contract was entrusted to 5th respondent by the Hyderabad Metro Water Supply and Sewerage Board, (4th respondent), for laying water pipe line from Kodandapur Reservoir to Nasarlapally Pump House in Krishna Drinking Water supply, Phase-III, Package-I work. The petitioner alleges that the 5th respondent is indulging in illegal activities and not providing good quality pipes and in future there is possibility of causing damage to these pipes and would be contrary to public interest. The petitioner alleges that the 4th respondent is hand in glove of the 5th respondent and is not monitoring the nature of work undertaken by the 5th respondent. Hence, this writ petition.

2. The averments made in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition do not disclose any personal injury suffered by the petitioner nor affecting his right in any manner directly. The cause espoused in the writ petition is in the form of an injury to the public at large. Thus, the cause in the writ petition is having larger public interest. In such matters a person who is seeking to espouse the cause, has to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court by filing Public Interest Litigation and not the writ petition as presented now.

3. Thus, the writ petition in the present form is not maintainable and the same is liable to be dismissed leaving it open to the petitioner to work out his remedy as available in law and also to file Public Interest Litigation. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand dismissed.

11th August, 2015.
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J