

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

WRIT PETITION NO.26379 OF 2015

Between:

Thoka Balaih.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. State of Andhra Pradesh, rep.by its Principal Secretary,
Civil Supplies, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad and three
others.

...RESPONDENTS

-
DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 20.08.2015

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

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.26379 OF 2015

ORDER:

The petitioner was appointed as a fair price shop dealer of shop No.8, Punugodu Village, Kanigiri Mandal, Prakasam District.

While so, the Enforcement Deputy Tahsildar, Kanigiri, Prakasam District, inspected the shop on 10.12.2014 and a show cause notice was issued to the petitioner on 20.02.2015. Based on the said charges, the petitioner submitted his explanation and after receipt of explanation from the petitioner, the authorization of the petitioner was cancelled on 17.03.2015. Against the said order of cancellation, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the second respondent and the second respondent did not pass any orders on the stay application filed by the petitioner. Thereafter, the petitioner filed W.P.No.13513 of 2015 and this Court disposed of the same on 30.04.2015 directing the second respondent to dispose of the appeal within a period of four weeks. Ultimately, the appeal was disposed of on 04.07.2015 remanding the matter to the third respondent with a direction to finalize the disciplinary proceedings afresh within one month. When the third respondent did not dispose of the matter consequent to remand of the matter from the second respondent, the present Writ Petition is filed.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for Civil Supplies for the respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that due to political reasons, the authorization of the petitioner was cancelled and the third respondent is not taking any action even after remand was made by the second respondent.

This Court cannot appreciate the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner since the second respondent passed an order remanding the matter to the third respondent. The third respondent ought to have considered the case within the time stipulated by the second respondent. In the circumstances, the third respondent is directed to dispose the disciplinary proceedings pending against the petitioner consequent to the remand in accordance with

law within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and pass a reasoned order thereon.

The Writ Petition is, accordingly, disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

(A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J)

20th August 2015
RRB