

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.1891 OF 2010

Between:

M/s. Narne Estates Private Limited

.. Petitioner

and

Union of India and others

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: August 03,
2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-
-

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. SHANKAR NARAYANA**

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 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 | Yes/No |

see the fair copy of the Judgment?

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. SHANKAR NARAYANA**
-
WRIT PETITION No.1891 OF 2010

ORDER: (Per Hon'ble Sri Justice R. Subhash Reddy)

This Writ Petition is filed with the prayer, which reads as under:

“... to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Prohibition to prevent the learned District Consumer Redressal Forum – III from entertaining C.C.No.807 of 2009 and from usurping its jurisdiction with which it is not legally vested, and to confine within limits of its jurisdiction and by declaring the action of the learned District Forum is nothing but exceeding its jurisdiction which is arbitrary and unconstitutional and violative of fundamental rights enshrined in the Constitution of India and to pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deems fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”

It is submitted by the learned counsel for respondent No.4 that the subject matter of this Writ Petition is squarely covered by the judgment of this Court in **Narne Construction P. Ltd., Secunderabad v. Union of India** and others^[1].

Sri Venkat Reddy Donthi Reddy, learned counsel, submits that he has given up vakalat for the petitioner and

he is not appearing in the matter.

When the matter is called, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner by any other Advocate.

We have perused the aforesaid judgment of this Court. As the subject matter of this Writ Petition is squarely covered by the aforesaid judgment, this Writ Petition is also dismissed following the aforesaid judgment and for the reasons recorded therein. Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Writ Petition shall stand closed. No costs.

R. SUBHASH

REDDY, J

A. SHANKAR

NARAYANA, J
August 03, 2015
MD

[\[1\]](#) 2011 (1) ALD 342