

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.23264 OF 2015

—
—

Between:

Pattabhi Srinivas.

.. Petitioner

And

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Ex-Officer, Secretary to Government, Department of Civil
Supplies, Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 06.08.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgment? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals | Yes/No |
| 3. Whether Their Lordship wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 23264 of 2015

ORDER:

The petitioner was appointed as a fair price shop dealer of shop No.11, Toopran Village and Mandal, Medak District. The authorization of the petitioner is valid upto 31.03.2016. The Mandal Revenue Inspector inspected the shop on 30.06.2015 and found 12.85 quintals of less rice. On the basis of the report dated 01.07.2015 submitted by the Tahsildar, Toopran Village, the authorization of the petitioner was suspended for a period of three months by the impugned proceedings dated 13.07.2015. Challenging the same, the present Writ Petition is filed.

The Writ Petition came up 'for admission' on 28.07.2015 and it was adjourned to 03.08.2015 for instructions of the learned Government Pleader for Civil Supplies.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner produced before this Court a copy of the release order dated 31.07.2015 issued by the Tahsildar, Toopran Village to the Godown Incharge, MLSP Toopran Village asking him to deliver the same quantity of rice i.e. 12.85 quintals in favour of the petitioner. He submits that there is no variation in quantity and, as such, the suspension of the petitioner is unwarranted.

In view of the release order dated 31.07.2015, this Court is inclined to accept the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. The impugned order of the second respondent dated 13.07.2015 is set aside. Since the only allegation relates to variation in quantity of rice, and there are no other allegations, no enquiry is needed to be conducted by the second respondent.

The Writ Petition is, accordingly, allowed.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand disposed of. No order as to costs.

A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO,J

Date:06.08.2015

usd

