

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

WRIT PETITION No. 24076 OF 2015

Between:

Singamaneni Sudhakar Rao

.. Petitioner

and

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by Principal
Secretary, Panchayat Raj & Rural Development
Department, Hyderabad and others

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 03.08.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C. PRAVEEN KUMAR

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 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 Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C. PRAVEEN KUMAR

WRIT PETITION No. 24076 of 2015

ORDER:

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents 3 and 4. With the consent of the parties, the writ petition is disposed of at the admission stage itself.

The present writ petition came to be filed seeking issuance of writ of mandamus declaring the action of the 3rd respondent in terminating the petitioner from service vide proceedings Rc.No.D5/582/EGS/2014 dated 28.05.2015, as illegal and arbitrary.

The case of the petitioner is that he was working as Field Assistant in the Grampanchayat, Nandanavanam Village, Jarugumalli Mandalam, Prakasam District, under "Mahatma Gandhi National Employment Guarantee Scheme". While things stood thus, the 3rd respondent is said to have terminated the services of the petitioner on the ground that he voluntarily submitted resignation, vide proceedings Rc.No.D5/582/EGS/2014 dated 28.05.2015. It is stated that due to the pressure of local villagers and politicians, the petitioner was forcibly made to submit resignation, though there were no remarks against him. On 09.07.2015, the petitioner is said to have made an appeal before the Commissioner, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development Department, Hyderabad (2nd respondent), questioning the order of termination dated 28.05.2015 passed by the 3rd respondent, which is still pending consideration. Hence, the present writ petition.

Though various grounds are raised in the writ petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner seeks early disposal of the appeal filed by him before the 2nd respondent, for which the learned counsel

for the respondents 3 and 4 did not object.

Having regard to the circumstances stated above and without going into the merits of the case, the 2nd respondent is directed to consider the appeal dated 09.07.2015 filed by the petitioner and dispose of the same within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order, in accordance with law.

With the above direction, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

Consequently, miscellaneous petitions pending if any in the writ petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE C. PRAVEEN KUMAR

1st August, 2015

cbs

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C. PRAVEEN KUMAR

WRIT PETITION No. 24076 of 2015

1st August, 2015

cbs