

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

WRIT PETITION No.32678 of 2012

Between:

Ch.V.V.Prasada Rao

... Petitioner/Appellant (s)

and

The Hyderabad Metro Water Supply &
Sewerage Board, Khairatabad, Hyd.

-

... Respondent (s)

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 03.08.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

- | | | |
|----------|---|---------------|
| <u>1</u> | <u>Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments?</u> | <u>Yes/No</u> |
|
 | | |
| <u>2</u> | <u>Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reports/Journals</u> | <u>Yes/No</u> |
|
 | | |
| <u>3</u> | <u>Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment?</u> | <u>Yes/No</u> |

-

-

-

-

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.32678 OF 2012

ORDER:

The case of the petitioner is that he is the co-owner of the house bearing municipal No.23-76/A, Nethaji Nagar, Saroornagar, Ranga Reddy District, along with his brother Ch.Ramanjaneyulu. They have been paying all the water bills since inception, to the

respondent authorities as per the norms and statutory rules. While so, the respondent board issued bill for the month of July, 2012 for an amount of Rs.17,601.94 charging interest and also arrears for an amount of

Rs.16,575/-. When the petitioner approached the respondent authorities for settlement of the grievance, meanwhile the operator of the respondent authorities disconnected the water supply and connection, without any notice. Aggrieved by the same, present writ petition is filed.

This Court while ordering Notice before admission on 17.10.2012, granted interim direction to the respondent Board for restoration of water connection subject to payment Rs.8,800/- by the petitioner.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Sri T.Sudhakar Reddy, learned counsel appearing for respondents 1 and 3 submits that as per the orders passed by this Court on 17.10.2012 water connection has been restored on payment of Rs.8,800/- by the petitioner and that if the petitioner has any grievance, he can make an application to the respondent No.3 and it can be considered and necessary orders will be passed.

In this writ petition this Court cannot decide the issue whether the respondents issued bills in excess of the consumption made by the petitioner. It is for the petitioner to make a representation before the 3rd respondent in respect of his grievance and the respondent Board to consider the same and pass orders.

In view of the above, this writ petition is disposed of granting liberty to the petitioner to submit representation to the 3rd respondent in respect of his grievance, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and on such representation being made by the petitioner, the 3rd respondent shall consider the

same and pass orders in accordance with law. If the petitioner fails to submit any application, the respondents may take action according to law. Till then, stay of recovery of remaining amount out of Rs.17,601/-. But, however petitioner shall pay regular bills.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous applications, if any pending in the writ petition, shall stand closed.

A.RAJASHEKER REDDY, J

03.08.2015
t k.