

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD  
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH  
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY FIFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY  
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN  
PRESENT

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR**

**WRIT PETITION No.4487 of 2015**

**BETWEEN**

Morakonda Chenchu Lakshmi.

**... PETITIONER**

**AND**

The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Panchayat Raj and Rural Development Department, Secretariat, Superintendent of Police, Guntur and others.

**...RESPONDENTS**

**Counsel for the Petitioner: MR. I. KOTI REDDY**

**Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ &  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (AP)  
MR. M.S.R. CHANDRA MURTHY**

**The Court made the following:**

-  
-  
-

**ORDER:**

Petitioner, working as Field Assistant of Chandaluru Village, J. Panguluru Mandal, Prakasam District, was given a show cause notice dated 26.12.2014 alleging certain irregularities. Petitioner gave a reply dated 29.12.2014 to the said allegations. Petitioner states that without conducting any enquiry the third respondent has straightway the impugned order of termination dated 31.01.2015. Present writ petition is filed questioning the legality of the order of termination.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegations made against the petitioner are trivial in nature and are not substantiated at all but the petitioner stands terminated on the basis of those unsubstantiated allegations.

3. It is, however, not in dispute that the petitioner has preferred an appeal on 13.02.2015, which is now pending with the second respondent. Since the petitioner has already invoked an appellate remedy against the impugned order of termination, it would not be appropriate to exercise discretion under Article 226 of the Constitution of India by entertaining the writ petition, particularly, as the petitioner is at liberty to raise all his contentions in the appeal pending before the second respondent. In the circumstances, therefore, it is just and appropriate to direct the second respondent to hear and dispose of the said appeal of the petitioner at the earliest, preferably, within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

The writ petition is disposed of. As a sequel, the miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

---

VILAS V. AFZULPURKAR, J

February 25, 2015

Note: Furnish C.C. of the order within two days.

(**B/o**) DSK