

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

\* \* \* \*

**WRIT PETITION No.26460 of 2015**

Between:

Samreddy Maheshwar Reddy.

....Petitioner

and

The State of Telangana,  
Rep.by its Principal Secretary,  
Consumer Affairs, Food and Civil Supplies Department,  
Secretariat, Hyderabad,  
And others.

....Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 20.08.2015

**SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO**

- |    |                                                                            |        |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 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 His Lordship wishes to see the fair copy of the Judgment?          | Yes/No |

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO**

-

**WRIT PETITION No.26460 of 2015**

**ORDER:**

The petitioner is the fair price shop dealer of shop No.691 of Laxmiguda RGK, Rajendranagar (Urban), Ranga Reddy District. It is the case of the petitioner that he purchased 2 quintals of rice for personal use and the same was kept in Maruti Alto car and when he tried to open the shop on 29.05.2015, the fourth respondent came to the shop and seized the vehicle along with the rice on the allegation that the said rice

was PDS rice. In respect of the said incident Crime No.351 of 2015 was registered on 29.05.2015 and based on the same, an order of suspension was passed by the second respondent on 20.07.2015. Challenging the same, the present Writ Petition is filed.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that, no proceedings were taken for violation of the Control Order and the rice, which is meant for personal use, was seized. He further submits that only a crime was registered against the petitioner and the petitioner has no connection with the said crime.

I am not impressed by the argument of the learned Counsel for the petitioner. The impugned order shows that the order of suspension was passed in view of the provision contained in the Control Order, which is quoted in the impugned order, and it reads as follows:

“As per the provisions of the Andhra Pradesh State Public Distribution System (Control) Order, 2008, Annexure-I(5). “The FPS authorization issued under this Order shall be liable for suspension or cancellation, as the case may be, if the FP Shop dealer/Nominated retailer/hawker is involved in any criminal case or when any case under EC’s Act, 1955 or any other similar Law is pending against him/her.”

In view of the above clear position, the Writ Petition is liable to be dismissed, and the same is, accordingly, dismissed. The miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

---

**(A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J)**

20.08.2015  
vs