

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

WRIT PETITION No. 21379 of 2015

BETWEEN

M.Srinivasulu

...Petitioner

And

The State of Andhra Pradesh,
Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Consumer Affairs, Food and Civil Supplies Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and ors.

...Respondents.

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 05.08.2015.

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO

1. Whether reports of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the judgments?
YES/NO

2. Whether the copies of judgments 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.

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 21379 of 2015

ORDER:

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for the respondents.

The petitioner claims to be the owner of lorry bearing Registration No. AP.04.V.0639. It appears that on 12.3.2014 the third respondent and his staff intercepted the said lorry and seized 400 bags of rice each containing 40 Kg. The seizure was on the ground that the said rice is meant for Public Distribution System. Later the third respondent submitted a report to the second respondent, who initiated 6-A proceedings and the same are pending. When the second respondent refused to release the said vehicle, the petitioner filed Writ Petition No. 27029 of 2014 and this Court by order dated 12.09.2014 disposed of the said Writ Petition directing the second respondent to release the vehicle on condition of the petitioner furnishing bank guarantee for a sum of Rs.1,36,800/-. The petitioner expressed his inability and filed the present Writ Petition.

When the this Writ Petition came up for consideration on

21.7.2015, the petitioner was asked to produce a copy of the RC book in order to verify the value of the vehicle. He disclosed that the vehicle is of the year 2004 make. Having regard to the same, the value of the vehicle decided by the second respondent cannot be said to be unreasonable. Now the petitioner still expressed his inability to furnish bank guarantee and sought for early disposal of the 6-A proceedings. Having regard to the same, the second respondent is directed to complete the enquiry before him and pass appropriate orders there on, in accordance with law, within a period of sixty days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

The Writ Petition is disposed of. Miscellaneous petitions pending consideration if any in the Writ Petition shall stand closed in consequence. No order as to costs.

JUSTICE A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO

DATED 5th August, 2015.
Msnr_x