

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

* * * *

CASE NO. W.P.No.23082 of 2012

Between:
Fishermen Cooperative Society,
represented by its President, Adilabad

.. Petitioner

and
The District Collector, Adilabad and others

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 12.08.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-
-

THE HON’BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 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 |

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.23082 of 2012

-
12.08.2015

Between:

Fishermen Cooperative Society,
represented by its President, Adilabad

.. Petitioner

and

The District Collector, Adilabad and others

.. Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner: M/s.Rastrapal

Counsel for respondent Nos.1 to 3: Assistant Government Pleader
for Fisheries (TS)

Counsel for respondent No.4: None appeared

-
The Court made the following:

-

-

-

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed for a *mandamus* to set aside letter No.562/D/2012, dated 19.07.2012, of respondent No.3, directing the petitioner to remove the iron mesh laid by it near Pandyapuri of Kedam river on or before 28.07.2012.

Counter-affidavit has been filed by respondent No.3. The necessity to advert to the contents of the counter-affidavit and the affidavit of the impleaded respondents is obviated for the reason that at the hearing, it is admitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the iron mesh has been removed and that same is not in existence as on today. While the learned Assistant Government Pleader for Fisheries (TS) and Mr.A.Jagan, learned counsel for the impleaded respondents, submitted that the petitioner itself removed the iron mesh, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the iron mesh was forcibly removed by the subordinates of respondent No.3 and the impleaded respondents. It is unnecessary for this Court to delve into the issue as to who removed the iron mesh. As the fact remains that the iron mesh was removed after the filing of the writ petition, the prayer in the writ petition to set aside the impugned letter of respondent No.3 directing removal of iron mesh has become infructuous.

The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed as infructuous.

As a sequel to dismissal of the writ petition, W.P.M.P.No.29469 of 2012, W.V.M.P.No.3804 of 2012 and W.V.M.P.(SR)No.140584 of 2012 shall stand dismissed as infructuous.

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

12th August, 2015
GHN