

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

\* \* \*

**WRIT PETITION No. 30834 of 2015**

**BETWEEN**

V.Vittal Rao

**... PETITIONERS**

**AND**

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Principal Secretary and others

**...RESPONDENTS**

Date of Order pronounced: 22.09.2015

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR**

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

-

-

**ORDER:-**

Heard.

2. Petitioner questions the action of the second respondent in not releasing the stamps and franking machine by renewing his licence, which was suspended earlier. It is evident from the record that petitioner is a stamp

vendor, who was suspended pending enquiry by order of the second respondent dated 05.02.2014. Same was subject matter of W.P.No.19607 of 2014 dated 15.07.2014. Subsequently, the second respondent revoked the suspension of the petitioner by his proceedings No.G1/151/2014 dated 10.03.2014. Operative portion whereof reads as follows:-

“As the enquiry getting delayed due to administrative reasons as reported by the enquiry officer, vide reference 5<sup>th</sup> cited, and sufficient time is elapsed after his being kept under suspension, though, it is not in the best interest of the administration by duly following the principals of natural justice, the suspension of the License of the Stamp Vendor is temporarily revoked for a period of one month or till the completion of enquiry, whichever earlier subject to condition that the stamp vendor shall cooperate in early completion of enquiry within a month.”

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the enquiry is still pending and not yet completed but because of the expiry of one month period, petitioner is not being given the stamps and franking machine and thereby unable to carry on his business.

4. I am unable to see any reason to entertain the writ petition as the order of revocation, extracted above, itself says that suspension of the petitioner is temporarily revoked for a period of one month or till the completion of enquiry whichever is earlier and since one month had expired the order has worked itself out. Petitioner's contention cannot be accepted as the aforesaid order does not state as one month or till completion of enquiry whichever is later. Hence, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in this writ petition. However, petitioner is at liberty to approach the second respondent bringing to his notice the hardship caused to him and it is for the second respondent to further extend the revocation till the completion of enquiry or such further period, as he deems appropriate.

With the liberty foresaid, writ petition is dismissed. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

---

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

September 22, 2015  
**LMV**