

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE SECOND DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN
PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION No.1767 of 2015

BETWEEN

P. Ganesh Anudeep.

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Higher Education
Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

...RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR. P. NARAYANA SWAMY

**Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR EDUCATION (TG)
MR. C. SUDESH ANAND
MR. ABHISHEK REDDY**

The Court made the following:

-
-
-

ORDER:

Petitioner herein states that he was admitted to the MBA course, under respondent No.4, in the college of respondent No.5.

However, petitioner's admission was not approved, as respondent No.4 did not approve the said admission on the ground that the petitioner had secured less than the minimum percentage of marks in the qualifying examination. Questioning the said order of respondent No.4, petitioner has approached this Court in WP.No.5560 of 2014, which was disposed of by order dated 26.02.2014 directing the first respondent to consider the request of the petitioner in terms of G.O.Rt.No.280 dated 25.05.2012.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, now submits that the first respondent in WP.No.5560 of 2014 was not the competent authority to consider the request of the petitioner for condonation and it is only the first respondent herein empowered to consider such a request to condone the irregular admission, if any. Learned counsel states that the petitioner has, accordingly, made an application before respondent No.5, which was forwarded by respondent No.5 with recommendation to respondent No.2. Learned counsel also states that the petitioner has once again personally made a representation dated 22.01.2015 before respondent No.1, which was acknowledged by the Department of Higher Education on 23.01.2015. Petitioner now seeks a direction for consideration of the said request by the respondent No.1.

3. Keeping in view the fact that the career of the petitioner depends upon the orders that would be passed by the first respondent on the aforesaid representation and reliance placed by the petitioner on G.O.Rt.No.280 dated 25.05.2012, it is appropriate to direct respondent No.1 to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 22.01.2015 and dispose of the same as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of two (2) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

The writ petition is disposed of. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

February 2, 2015
DSK