

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

WRIT PETITION No.24067 of 2015

Between:

Kati Prasada Rao, S/o. Satyanandam,
Aged about 75 years, Occ: Cultivation,
R/o. Rangappanaiduvaripalem Village,
Karamchedu Mandal,
Pakasam District & 10 others

.. Petitioners

AND

State of Andhra Pradesh,
Rep. by Principal Secretary to Government,
Panchayat Raj and Rural Development Department,
Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Saifabad,
Hyderabad & 4 others

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 03.08.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

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

-

-

-
-
-
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.24067 of 2015

-
ORDER:

According to the petitioners, petitioners 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11 were receiving old age pensions, 4th petitioner was receiving physically handicapped pension and petitioners 5 and 6 were receiving widow pensions. They have been receiving such pensions for the last more than five years, but in the recent revision suddenly pensions are stopped. Aggrieved by the decision to deny pension to the petitioners, an appeal was submitted to the Mandal Janmaboomi Committee on 02.06.2015 as envisaged by G.O.Ms.No.135, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development (RD.I) Department, dated 17.09.2014, and alleging that the said appeal is not disposed of, this writ petition is filed.

2. As seen from the report of the Mandal Parishad Development Officer, Karamchedu Mandal, Prakasam District (4th respondent), specific reasons are assigned to each of the persons for not granting pension. Thus, if the petitioners have valid justification of their entitlement for grant of pension and rejection against them was not made on valid grounds, they should submit a detailed appeal stating reasons in support of their claim that they are entitled to receive pension and if necessary, they should also enclose necessary documents,

whereas vague representation is made. Thus, it cannot be said that the respondent authorities failed to act on the said representation in re-considering their entitlement and the relief as sought for cannot be granted at this stage.

3. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners would be advised to submit a detailed appeal with all the supporting material in support of their claim.

4. Having regard to the said submission, the Writ Petition is disposed of granting liberty to the petitioners to make a detailed appeal to the Mandal Pension Committee. As and when such an appeal is filed, the Mandal Pension Committee shall consider the same having regard to the material submitted by them and take a decision, as warranted by law, within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of such appeal. If the petitioners are aggrieved by any adverse decision, it is open for them to work out their remedies. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand closed.

P.NAVEEN RAO, J

Date: 3rd August, 2015

KL



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-

-

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

WRIT PETITION No.24067 of 2015

-

Date: 3rd August, 2015

KL