

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

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY NINTH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR

WRIT PETITION No.1341 of 2015

BETWEEN

P.Rami Reddy

... PETITIONER

AND

The State of A.P., rep. by its Principal Secretary, Civil Supplies Department,
Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad and others

...RESPONDENTS

The Court made the following:

-
-

ORDER:

Heard.

2. Petitioner herein is a fair price shop dealer whose authorization was suspended by the Revenue Divisional Officer, (RDO) by proceedings, dated 10.10.2014 on certain allegations. Petitioner has already submitted detailed explanation before the RDO requesting him to revoke the authorization. It is stated that the RDO called for report from the Tahsildar on the explanation submitted by the petitioner and the Tahsildar, under his report, dated 15.12.2014 has examined the petitioner's explanation and recommended that the explanation of the petitioner, being genuine, be accepted and the authorization of the petitioner be restored. In spite of the said report having been received by the RDO, petitioner states that no orders are being passed by respondent No.2. Hence, the present writ petition is filed to declare the

order of suspension as illegal and unauthorized.

3. In my view, the order impugned being one of suspension pending enquiry, no interference of the said order is called for by this court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. However, since petitioner's explanation is already before respondent No.2 and that a report of the Tahsildar is also available with respondent No.2 there is no reason why respondent No.2 has not passed any order relating to the allegations against the petitioner.

4. Hence, the writ petition is disposed of directing respondent No.2 to take into consideration the report, as aforesaid, and pass appropriate orders thereon expeditiously without further loss of time within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

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

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

January 29, 2015
LMV