

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.24798 of 2015

Between:

M/s.Pavanaputhra Minerals.

....Petitioner

and

A.P.Mineral Development Corporation Limited,
Rep.by its Vice Chairman-cum-Managing Director,
6-2-915, 3rd floor, Rear Block (HMWSSB Premises),
Khairtabad, Hyderabad, and others.

....Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 07.08.2015

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.24798 of 2015

ORDER:

Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Counsel appearing for the second respondent.

Learned Counsel on either side conceded that the Rehabilitants' Pulverizing Mill owners, Welfare Association, APMDC Danger Zone earlier filed W.P.No.22163 of 2014 with identical relief and the same was disposed of on 11.12.2014 and against the said order, the petitioner in W.P.No.22163 of 2014 filed W.A.No.1661 of 2014 and the same was also

disposed of on 30.12.2014 and the operative portion of the said judgment reads as under :-

“After hearing the learned counsel for the parties we think that the following order will sub-serve the interest of justice for which both the learned counsel fairly agreed to.

The 2nd respondent shall take a decision as to whether they will supply the barytes in terms of the agreement to the writ petitioner – appellant or not within a period of one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and such decision must be communicated to the appellant within seven days from the date of taking the decision. In the event, decision is taken to supply the barytes to the appellant the same must be done forthwith. In the event, if they decided not to supply barytes then the respondent Corporation shall refund the amount paid by the writ petitioner – appellant. However, the bank accounts of the respondent Corporation shall be de-frozen and the amount paid by the writ petitioner association shall be refunded with interest as per bank rate within one month from the date of de-freezing of the accounts.”

Learned counsel on either side fairly conceded that the petitioner in the present writ petition is not member of the said association.

Learned Counsel for the second respondent fairly conceded that the issue involved in this writ petition is squarely covered by the Division Bench Judgment of this Court in W.A.No.1661 of 2014.

Learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the principal amount was already refunded and interest is yet to be paid.

On the other hand, learned Counsel for the second respondent submits that the interest was not paid to any member of the association, who were covered by W.A.No.1661 of 2014 and as and when the accounts of the 2nd respondent are de-frozen, they would take necessary steps in that regard.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, this Writ Petition is disposed of in terms of the Division Bench Judgment of this Court in W.A.No.1661 of 2015 dated 30.12.2014 making it applicable to the petitioner in the present writ petition also. Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Writ Petition shall stand closed.

07.08.2015
vs

(A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J)