

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

THURSDAY, THE SECOND DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION No.9233 of 2015

BETWEEN

Sri Balaji Lemon Company and others.

... PETITIONERS

AND

Person-In-Charge, Agricultural Market Committee, Eluru, West Godavari District and another.

...RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioners: MR. J. SESHAGIRI RAO

Counsel for the Respondents: MR. CHINTAPALLI SRINIVAS

The Court made the following:

-

-

ORDER:

All the petitioners are commission agents working with the Agricultural Market Committee, Eluru. The applications for renewal of their license were rejected by the identical orders dated 26.03.2015 stating that their request is rejected in view of the contrary legal opinion given by the standing counsel.

2. The present single writ petition is filed by all the petitioners questioning the rejection of various renewal applications of each of the petitioners. Though the petitioners have paid separate Court fee,

the Registry ought not to have entertained a single writ petition, as each licensee and his rejection is a separate cause of action and all the rejection orders cannot be clubbed in one single writ petition.

3. However, the adjudication of the present writ petition,

on merits, may not be necessary in view of the submission of

Mr. Chintapalli Srinivas, learned stand counsel that the orders of rejection were passed by the new Person-in-Charge without proper verification. Learned standing counsel, on instructions of the Selection Grade Secretary (Full Additional Charge), Agricultural Market Committee, submits that all the said rejection orders would be withdrawn and the case of each of the petitioners for renewal of their license shall be separately considered on merits. Learned standing counsel, therefore, fairly states that the impugned orders be set aside and the matter be remitted to respondents 1 and 2 to consider each case separately.

Recording the aforesaid submissions, the impugned orders are set aside and the writ petition is allowed. Respondents are directed to reconsider the request of the renewal of license of each petitioner separately on its own merits and pass appropriate orders.

As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no

order as to costs.

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

April 2, 2015

DSK