

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE A. V.SESHA SAI

WRIT PETITION Nos.11162, 11166, 11168, 11169,
11172,11174 & 19849 OF 2010

DATED 11TH December, 2015

BETWEEN

M/s. R.K.Engineers, rep. by its Manager (Projects)
G. Pandu Ranga Reddy

.....Petitioner in WP.No.11162 of 2010

M/s. R.K.Engineers, rep. by its Manager (Projects)
G.Panduranga Reddy

....Petitioner in WP.No.11166 of
2010

M/s. Lanco Infra Tech Ltd., rep. by its Manager (Projects)
G.Pandu Ranga Reddy

...Petitioner in WP.No.11168 of 2010

M/s. Back Bone Projects Ltd., rep. by its Manager (Projects)
G.Pandu Ranga Reddy

.....Petitioner in WP.No.11169 of 2010

M/s. R.K.Engineers, rep. by its Manager (Projects)
G.Pandu Ranga Reddy

...Petitioner in WP.No.11172 of
2010

M/s. Back Bone Projects Ltd., rep. by its Manager (Projects)
G.Pandu Ranga Reddy

....Petitioner in WP.No.11174 of
2010

M/s. Engineering Projects (India) Ltd, rep. by its Authorized
Signatory Sri G.S.Satyanadh.

...Petitioner in WP.No.19849 of
2010

And

The Director of Mines and Geology,

Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad and ors.

...Respondents in all WPs.

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE A. V.SESHA SAI

WRIT PETITION Nos.11162, 11166, 11168, 11169,
11172,11174 & 19849 OF 2010

COMMON ORDER:

-

When these matters are called today, it is represented by the learned Counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Pleader for the respondents that the issue involved in these Writ Petitions is squarely covered by the decision of this Court in Writ Petition Nos. 9464 of 2011 and batch, dated 12.08.2015 wherein it was held as follows:

“At the time when the matter is taken up for hearing, the learned Government Pleader for Assignment appearing for the respondents, on instructions received from the 2nd respondent, submits that the land admeasuring Acs.8.38 guntas situated in Survey No.118 of Tirumalagiri Village and Mandal is “Shikam Talab” and, as per the norms, Shikam land cannot be either alienated or allotted or assigned for any other purpose.

Since the land sought for by the petitioner is a Shikam Talab, which cannot be alienated or assigned (See (2001) 6 SCC 496, (2001) 4 ALD 758 and (2001) 4 ALD 776), the question of allotting the said land for the purpose of constructing a Temple does not arise. Further, the counsel for the writ petitioner is not present in spite of the matter being posted under the caption “for orders”. It appears that the petitioner is not interested in prosecuting the matter. Hence, the Writ Petition is liable to be dismissed for non-prosecution also.”

Following the aforesaid decision of this Court and for the

reasons stated therein, these Writ Petitions are disposed of in terms thereof.

Miscellaneous petitions pending consideration if any in these Writ Petitions shall stand closed in consequence. No order as costs.

JUSTICE A. V.SESHA SAI

DATED 11th December, 2015 .
Msnr_x