

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

**WRIT PETITION Nos.13311, 13312, 13316, 13317, 13318, 13320 and 13324 of
2012**

COMMON ORDER:

In all these writ petitions, the petitioners challenged the impugned notice dated 16.04.2012 issued under Section 636 of the Hyderabad Municipal Corporation Act(for short 'the Act'), by the 1st respondent.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri N.Ashok Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2 and Sri K.Venu Madhav, learned counsel for respondent No.3.

It is the case of the petitioners that they filed explanation in pursuance of the notice under Section 452 of the Act even before the impugned proceedings were issued and without considering the same, the impugned proceedings were issued, which is in violation of principles of natural justice.

A perusal of the impugned proceedings goes to show that the explanations filed by the petitioners in pursuance of the notices under Section 452 of the Act were not considered. However on the ground of principles of natural justice only, these writ petitions are allowed by setting aside the impugned notice dated 16.04.2012 issued by the 1st respondent and the 1st respondent shall consider the explanations submitted by the petitioners in accordance with law after giving opportunity to them and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

Accordingly, these Writ Petitions are allowed. No costs. Miscellaneous petitions, pending if any, shall stand closed.

A.RAJASHEKER REDDY, J

Date: 25-08-2015

pab