

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

W.P.No.16354 of 2015

Date: 12.06.2015

Between :

Edara Haribabu s/o. Chenchaiyah, Aged about 59 years,
R/o.D.No.5-79, NGOs Colony, Venkateshwara Nagar,
Opp: Power Office, Ongole, Prakasham District.

..... Petitioner

And

The Chief Electoral Officer, Andhra Pradesh/
Ex-Officio and Principal Secretary to Government,
Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad and others.

..... Respondents

This Court made the following order:

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.16354 of 2015

ORDER:

Petitioner was elected as Member, Zilla Parishad Territorial Constituency (ZPTC) of Ponnalur Mandal, Prakasam District. He successfully contested for the post of Chairperson of Zilla Praja Parishad Prakasam. Against the election of the petitioner as Chairperson of ZPP, complaint was made to the District Collector and acting on the said complaint, petitioner was disqualified as Chairperson and as ZPTC member on the ground that petitioner violated the whip given by the party represented by him. Challenging the same, petitioner filed EOP Nos.8 and 9 of 2014 in the District Court/Election Tribunal. Petitioner also filed I.A.Nos.1967 and 1984 of 2014 in the said EOPs respectively. The said I.As were dismissed. Aggrieved thereby, petitioner filed W.P.Nos.30790 and 30791 of 2014. These two writ petitions were considered and disposed of by common order dated 7.11.2014. Writ petitions filed by the petitioner were allowed and the orders passed by the Election Tribunal are quashed. As a consequence, the orders passed disqualifying the petitioner as ZPTC member and as Chairperson of ZPP, Prakasham District was suspended. Aggrieved thereby, Writ Appeal Nos.1386 and 1388 of 2014 were filed. This court directed the Vice-Chairperson, to discharge the functions of the Chairperson until further orders by order dated 10.12.2014. Aggrieved thereby, S.L.P.No.3664 of 2014 is filed and the Supreme Court by order dated 09.01.2015 granted interim stay of the order of the High Court. By further order dated 27.02.2015, petitioner was directed not to press the contempt petition before the High Court.

2. On account of the orders passed by the Supreme Court , the judgment rendered

by this Court dated 07.11.2014 stands and in terms thereof, the orders of disqualification stands suspended.

3. Election Commission intend to conduct elections to the vacancies in the Legislative council for the State of Andhra Pradesh including vacancy from Prakasam Local Authorities Constituency. As member of the ZPTC and Chairperson of Zilla Parishad, petitioner is entitled to include his name in the list of voters to elect member of the Legislative Council for the State of Andhra Pradesh from Prakasam Local Authorities Constituency. On 18.05.2015 electoral list was published by the Electoral Registration Officer, Prakasam District, wherein the name of the petitioner was not included. Petitioner submitted representations on 23.05.2015 and on 02.06.2015 against exclusion of his name in the electoral list.

4. Alleging that no orders are passed on his representation and illegally his name was excluded from electoral list, petitioner filed W.P.No.15765 of 2015. When the matter was taken up for consideration, Court was informed that the Electoral Registration Officer informed petitioner by his endorsement dated 02.06.2015 that he has not submitted application for inclusion of his name as per Form-17 prescribed and was advised to submit proper application. Accordingly, petitioner submitted application in Form-17 on 04.06.2015.

5. Having regard to the said submissions, by order dated 05.06.2015, this Court directed the Joint Collector cum Electoral Registration Officer, Prakasam District to consider the application submitted by the petitioner in Form-17 as well as his earlier representations dated 23.05.2015 and 02.06.2015 regarding inclusion of his name in the electoral list for election to the member of Andhra Pradesh legislative Council from Prakasam Local Authorities Constituency and to pass appropriate orders and to communicate the same to the petitioner.

6. Consequent to the directions issued by this Court, the Joint Collector cum Electoral Registration Officer passed orders dated 06.06.2015 rejecting the request of the petitioner to include his name in the electoral list. Aggrieved thereby, this writ

petition is instituted.

7. Heard Sri. C.V. Mohan Reddy, senior counsel appearing for the petitioner and Sri Avinash Desai, learned counsel appearing for respondents 1 to 3.

8. Learned senior counsel contended that in view of the orders passed by this Court on 07.11.2014 in W.P.Nos.30790 and 30791 of 2014, wherein the orders of disqualification as ZPTC Member, and Chairperson of Zilla Praja Parishad, Prakasham District were suspended, petitioner continues to be the ZPTC Member and Chairperson and, therefore, entitled to inclusion of his name in the electoral list. Thus, the order of the Electoral Registration Officer in rejecting the request of the petitioner is erroneous and is *ex facie* illegal.

9. Learned senior counsel further contended that having regard to the orders passed by this Court, the Electoral Registration Officer ought to have independently considered the claim of petitioner and erred in relying on list furnished by the Chief Executive Officer of Zilla Praja Parishad, Ongole. Relying on the views expressed by the Chief Executive Officer, who was acting against the petitioner in *mala fide* manner, is erroneous. Rejection of application on the ground of delay was erroneous. There was no delay. Representations were submitted on 23.05.2015 and 02.06.215. There was no independent application of mind.

10. Learned counsel Sri Avinash Desai representing the respondents 1 to 3 contended that against the order passed by the Electoral Registration Officer in accordance with the provision contained in Section 24 of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (for short, 'Act, 1950'), an appeal shall lie to the Chief Electoral Officer and without exhausting the remedy of appeal, the writ petition is not maintainable. Learned counsel further contended that on the justification or the reasons assigned by the Electoral Officer in rejecting the request of the petitioner can also be agitated before the Chief Electoral Officer in the appeal and it cannot be assumed that the appellate authority would not consider such objection, even without availing the remedy of appeal.

11. Learned counsel further contended that in accordance with provision contained in Section 27(2)(d) of the Act, 1950 read with second proviso to Rule 30 (2) of the Registration of Electors Rules, 1960 (for short, 'Rules, 1960'), insofar as preparation of electoral list to elect members of Legislative Council from the local bodies, inclusion or exclusion of name in the electoral list is based on the information furnished by the concerned Chief Executive Officer of Zilla Praja Parishad and since the Chief Executive Officer of the Zilla Praja Parishad, Prakasam did not furnish the name of the petitioner in the list furnished to the Electoral Registration Officer, the name of the petitioner is not included. Further, request for inclusion has to be submitted within the time granted in Form-17, whereas petitioner did not submit Form-17 within time.

12. On availing remedy of appeal, learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that alternative remedy is not a bar to entertain the writ petition and the Writ Court has wide jurisdiction to entertain the writ petitions notwithstanding availability of remedy of appeal. In the context of this case, the remedy of appeal is not an efficacious remedy. The rejection of request of the petitioner to include his name in the electoral list was on the ground that the name of the petitioner was not shown in the list furnished by the Chief Executive Officer of Zilla Praja Parishad. Whereas in view of the orders passed by this court on 07.11.2014 in W.P.Nos.30790 and 30791 of 2014, the petitioner continues to be the ZPTC Member and Chairperson of Zilla Praja Parishad, Prakasam and the Electoral Registration Officer ought to have considered this aspect while dealing with the representations submitted by the petitioner. Non-consideration of the same by the Electoral Registration Officer vitiates the entire proceedings and, therefore, petitioner cannot be compelled to avail the remedy of appeal. At the stage of appeal also, the appellate authority may take the same view. In such an event grave prejudice would be caused to petitioner. Without any justification and due to *mala fide* action of Chief Executive Officer of Zilla Praja Parishad grave injustice is caused to him.

13. Learned senior counsel further contended that though ample discretion is vested in this Court to entertain or not to entertain the writ petition if statutory remedy of

appeal is available, such discretion has to be exercised in just and equitable manner. He further submitted that insofar as the Electoral Registration Officer is concerned, time limit is prescribed, whereas no such time limit is prescribed to the appellate authority to consider the appeal. Petitioner has very limited time available before last date approaches i.e., 16.6.2015 and it is not possible to dispose of appeal before 16.6.2015. In view of the strict time constraint the remedy of appeal cannot be treated as efficacious remedy and therefore writ petition is maintainable. Otherwise grave injustice would be caused to the petitioner and he would be denied of his vested right to cast his vote in ensuing elections. He further submitted that there is no further adjudication of facts. Thus, he cannot be compelled to avail remedy of appeal.

14. In support of his contention, learned senior counsel placed reliance on the decisions of Supreme Court in the cases of **A.V.Venkateswaran, Collector of Customs, Bombay v. Ramchand Sobhraj Wadhawani and another** and in the case of **P.T.Rajan v. T.P.M. Sahir and others**.

15. In reply, learned counsel Sri Avinash Desai further submitted that what is contended by the learned senior counsel is based on presumption on what appellate authority would do and it is premature to go into the issue of what appellate authority would do even before an appeal is preferred. He further submitted that it cannot be said that Chief Electoral Officer would not consider the appeal before the last date of inclusion of persons name in the electoral list.

16. Petitioner had erred in not availing the remedy of appeal soon after the order was passed and erred in invoking of the jurisdiction of this Court. Petitioner has to blame himself for wasting time in availing remedy of appeal and cannot be permitted to contend that no time is available to him to file an appeal and to invite an order by the appellate authority before the last date approaches. He further submitted that petitioner has statutory right to vote. Non-inclusion of his name in the electoral list, does not take away his right to contest the election. There is no requirement of inclusion of person name in the electoral list as a condition precedent to participate

in the elections.

17. Statute which conferred right to vote also created appellate mechanism against a decision made by the competent authority, statute created the remedy of appeal. There is no good reason for the petitioner to invoke extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court. Though this Court has wide amplitude of discretion to entertain the writ petition even when remedy of appeal is available, but ordinarily the Court does not entertain the writ petition when an alternative remedy of appeal is available and this case does not present any extraordinary circumstance warranting exercising jurisdiction by this Court notwithstanding availability of remedy of appeal to the petitioner.

18. He further contended that petitioner failed to file objection or application in proper form and waited till the last minute and that too only when it was pointed to him that he did not submit his application as mandated by the Act and Rules made there under, he submitted the application as per Form-17.

19 I have given my anxious consideration to rival contentions. The point for consideration is whether writ petition is maintainable when statutory remedy of appeal is available to petitioner ?

20. Section 21 of the Act, 1950 provides for preparation and revision of electoral rolls. Section 22 provides for correction of entries in electoral rolls. Section 23 deals with inclusion of names in electoral rolls. This section is applicable in the case where the name of the person is not included in the electoral rolls already published. Section 27 deals with preparation of electoral rolls for council Constituencies. Section 24 provides right to appeal against decision of Electoral Registration Officer. Relevant provisions concerning this case are Sections 24 and 27(2)(d) of the Act, 1950. The said provisions read as under:

Section 24 : **Appeals:--** An appeal shall lie within such time and in such manner as may be prescribed:

a. to the (district Magistrate or additional district magistrate or

executive magistrate or district collector or an officer of equivalent rank) from any order of the electoral registration officer under Section 22 or Section 23.

- b. {To the chief electoral officer, from any order of the district magistrate or the additional district magistrate under clause (a)}

Section 27: Preparation of electoral rolls for Council constituencies:

(1) xxx xx

(2) For the purpose of elections to the Legislative Council of a State in any local authorities' constituency---

(a) xxxxx

(b) xxxxx

(c) xxxxx

(d) in order to enable the electoral registration officer to maintain the electoral roll corrected up-to-date, the chief executive officer of every local authority (by whatever designation such officer may be known) shall immediately inform the electoral registration officer about every change in the membership of that local authority; and the electoral registration officer shall, on receipt of the information, strike off from the electoral roll the names of persons who have ceased to be, and include therein the names of persons who have become, members of that local authority;

21. In exercise of power vested by Act, 1950, the Registration of Electors Rules, 1960 was notified. The relevant Rules are 26 and 30. Rule 26 deals with correction of entries and inclusion of names in electoral rolls and is applicable to Members of Legislative Assembly etc. Rule 30 deals with Rolls for local authorities' constituencies. This Rule adopts the provision in Rule 26 (1) and (2) and Rule 27. Insofar as this case is concerned, second proviso to Rule 30 is relevant. It reads as under:

Rule 30: Rolls for local authorities' constituencies:

(1) xxxxx

(2) The provisions of (rule 26 except sub-rules (3) and (4) thereof and rule 27) shall apply in relation to local authorities' constituencies as they apply in

relation to assembly constituencies:

Provided that an application for the inclusion of a name shall be made in Form-17”

Provided further that where an application referred to in sub-rule (1) of rule 26 is received by the electoral registration officer, he shall refer such application to the chief executive officer, of the local authority concerned and on receipt of information in relation thereto from the chief executive officer, the electoral registration officer shall act in accordance with clause (d) of sub-section (2) of section 27).

22. Section 27 (2) (d) read with Rule 30 prescribes that the inclusion or exclusion of the name in the electoral list for council Constituencies from the local bodies shall be as per the list furnished by the Chief Executive Officer. The request of the petitioner was rejected by the Electoral Officer by relying on provision in Section 27(2)(d) and second proviso to Rule 30. On such decision right of appeal is provided to Chief Electoral Officer.

23. Article 226 of the Constitution vests wide discretion in the Writ Court to entertain the writ petition on any grievance and to grant appropriate relief. It is an extraordinary jurisdiction vested in the writ Court. The Writ Courts observe self-imposed restraint in exercising the jurisdiction under Article 226. Availability of alternative remedy is not a bar to entertain a writ petition. Ordinarily the writ petition is not entertained under Article 226 if the aggrieved person has an efficacious and effective remedy provided by concerned statute where under an adverse decision is taken against the person, which he seeks to assail in the writ petition. Constitutional Courts have laid down parameters for exercising of such discretion.

24. In **Commissioner of Income Tax and others Vs. Chhabil Dass Agarwal**, Supreme Court exhaustively reviewed the precedents on the subject and held as under:

“ 11. Before discussing the fact proposition, we would notice the principle of law as laid down by this Court. It is settled law that non-entertainment of petitions under writ jurisdiction by the High Court when an efficacious alternative remedy

is available is a rule of self-imposed limitation. It is essentially a rule of policy, convenience and discretion rather than a rule of law. Undoubtedly, it is within the discretion of the High Court to grant relief under Article 226 despite the existence of an alternative remedy. However, the High Court must not interfere if there is an adequate efficacious alternative remedy available to the petitioner and he has approached the High Court without availing the same unless he has made out an exceptional case warranting such interference or there exist sufficient grounds to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226. (See *State of U.P. v. Mohd. Nooh* 2 , *Titaghur Paper Mills Co. Ltd. v. State of Orissa*, *Harbanslal Sahnia v. Indian Oil Corpn. Ltd.* 4 and *State of H.P. v. Gujarat Ambuja Cement Ltd.*)

12. The Constitution Benches of this Court in ***K.S. Rashid and Son v. Income Tax Investigation Commission***, ***Sangram Singh v. Election Tribunal, Union of India v. T.R. Varma***, ***State of U.P. v. Mohd. Nooh*** and ***K.S. Venkataraman and Co. (P) Ltd. v. State of Madras*** have held that though Article 226 confers very wide powers in the matter of issuing writs on the High Court, the remedy of writ is absolutely discretionary in character. If the High Court is satisfied that the aggrieved party can have an adequate or suitable relief elsewhere, it can refuse to exercise its jurisdiction. The Court, in extraordinary circumstances, may exercise the power if it comes to the conclusion that there has been a breach of the principles of natural justice or the procedure required for decision has not been adopted. [See ***N.T. Veluswami Thevar v. G. Raja Nainar***, ***Municipal Council, Khurai v. Kamal Kumar***, ***Siliguri Municipality v. Amalendu Das***, ***S.T. Muthusami v. K. Natarajan***, ***Rajasthan SRTC v. Krishna Kant***, ***Kerala SEB v. Kurien E. Kalathil***, ***A. Venkatasubbiah Naidu v. S. Chellappan***, ***L.L. Sudhakar Reddy v. State of A.P.***, ***Shri Sant Sadguru Janardan Swami (Moingiri Maharaj) Sahakari Dugdha Utpadak Sanstha v. State of Maharashtra***, ***Pratap Singh v. State of Haryana*** and ***GKN Driveshafts (India) Ltd. V. ITO***

....

....

15. Thus, while it can be said that this Court has recognised some exceptions to the rule of alternative remedy i.e. where the statutory authority has not acted in accordance with the provisions of the enactment in question, or in defiance of the fundamental principles of judicial procedure, or has resorted to invoke the provisions which are repealed, or when an order has been passed in total violation of the principles of natural justice, the proposition laid down in *Thansingh Nathmal* case, *Titaghur Paper Mills* case and other similar judgments that the High Court will not entertain a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution if an effective alternative remedy is available to the aggrieved person or the statute under which the action complained of has been taken itself

contains a mechanism for redressal of grievance still holds the field. ***Therefore, when a statutory forum is created by law for redressal of grievances, a writ petition should not be entertained ignoring the statutory dispensation.***” (emphasis supplied)

25. In **Nivedita Sharma Vs. Cellular Operators Association of India and others**, Supreme Court held as under:

“11. We have considered the respective arguments/ submissions. There cannot be any dispute that the power of the High Courts to issue directions, orders or writs including writs in the nature of habeas corpus, certiorari, mandamus, quo warranto and prohibition under Article 226 of the Constitution is a basic feature of the Constitution and cannot be curtailed by parliamentary legislation—*L. Chandra Kumar v. Union of India* [(1997) 3 SCC 261]. However, it is one thing to say that in exercise of the power vested in it under Article 226 of the Constitution, the High Court can entertain a writ petition against any order passed by or action taken by the State and/or its agency/instrumentality or any public authority or order passed by a quasi-judicial body/authority, and it is an altogether different thing to say that each and every petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution must be entertained by the High Court as a matter of course ignoring the fact that the aggrieved person has an effective alternative remedy. ***Rather, it is settled law that when a statutory forum is created by law for redressal of grievances, a writ petition should not be entertained ignoring the statutory dispensation.*** ” (emphasis supplied)

.....

.....

16. It can, thus, be said that this Court has recognised some exceptions to the rule of alternative remedy. However, the proposition laid down in *Thansingh Nathmal v. Supt. of Taxes* (AIR 1964 SC 1419) and other similar judgments that the High Court will not entertain a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution if an effective alternative remedy is available to the aggrieved person or the statute under which the action complained of has been taken itself contains a mechanism for redressal of grievance still holds the field.

26. Learned senior counsel placed heavy reliance on the decision of the Supreme Court in **A.V.Venkateswaran**. Supreme Court was considering the scope of

entertainment of the writ petition when an alternative efficacious statutory remedy of appeal is available. Supreme Court referred to two earlier decisions in the cases of ***Union of India v. T.R. Varma*** (AIR 1957 SC 882) and ***State of Uttar Pradesh v. Mohammad Nooh*** (AIR 1958 SC 86) and held as under:

“10. The passages in the judgments of this Court we have extracted would indicate (1) that the two exceptions which the learned Solicitor-General formulated to the normal rule as to the effect of the existence of an adequate alternative remedy were by no means exhaustive, and (2) that even beyond them a discretion vested in the High Court to have entertained the petition and granted the petitioner relief notwithstanding the existence of an alternative remedy. We need only add that the broad lines of the general principles on which the Court should act having been clearly laid down, their application to the facts of each particular case must necessarily be dependent on a variety of individual facts which must govern the proper exercise of the discretion of the court, and that in a matter which is thus pre-eminently one of discretion, it is not possible or even if it were, it would not be desirable to lay down inflexible rules which would be applied with rigidity in every case which comes up before the Court.”

27. The two decisions relied upon by the Supreme Court in ***A.V.Venkateswaran*** were considered along with several other decisions by the Supreme Court in the case of ***Commissioner of Income Tax***, referred to supra.

28. In ***Nivedita Sharma*** also Supreme Court reiterated that High Court would not entertain a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India if an effective alternative remedy is available to the aggrieved person or statute to which the action complained of has been taken itself contains a mechanism for redressal of grievances.

29. It is not the case of petitioner that Electoral Registration Officer lacks competence to decide the issue nor was his decision vitiated with ill motive and perversity. In the instant case, Section 24 of Act, 1950 provides right of appeal to the Chief Electoral Officer against decision of Electoral Registration Officer. Such a remedy is effective and efficacious. All contentions urged by the petitioner in the writ petition can be agitated before the Appellate Authority.

30. Act 1950 is self contained code dealing with all the aspects of elections to the State Legislative Assembly, Council and Indian Parliament. The Act creates hierarchy of authorities to deal with various aspects of elections. The Electoral Registration Officer is the primary authority who draws list of electors in a constituency. Against the decision of the Electoral Registration Officer, appeal shall lie under Section 24 to the Chief Electoral Officer. On the date when the decision was given by the Electoral Registration Officer, petitioner was conscious of remedy of appeal. Without exhausting the said remedy, petitioner directly invoked the jurisdiction of this Court. While considering the objection of learned senior counsel that petitioner has very short time before which a decision of the appellate authority is required to be made and is not sufficient, it is necessary to note that on the day the order was passed by the Electoral Registration Officer, petitioner had sufficient time to prefer appeal. The time consumed by the petitioner to file this writ petition and matter considered by this Court cannot be taken into consideration to accept the said contention. Furthermore, that there is no likelihood of the appellate authority passing orders before the last date and that appellate authority may not consider the contentions that can be urged by the petitioner when the Electoral Registration Officer has not considered is speculative and writ petition cannot be entertained notwithstanding availability of efficacious remedy on such assumption.

31. The observations made by Justice Sarkar in the dissenting opinion in **A.V.Venkateswaran** aptly apply to this case. He held as under:

“15. Tendolkar, J. held that the writ could issue though the other remedy had not been pursued, as the order of assessment under Item 61(8) was without jurisdiction. This was clearly wrong. The Collector had ample jurisdiction to decide under which item in the schedule the fountain-pens had to be assessed to duty, and if he made a mistake in his decision that did not make his order one without jurisdiction: cp. *Gulabdas & Co. v. Assistant Collector of Customs (S)* AI§ 1957 SC 733. The learned Judges of the appellant Bench held that the writ was properly issued, not because the assessing authority had no jurisdiction to assess the goods under Item 61(8), but because at the date the matter had come before them, the other remedy had become barred. This again is, in my view, plainly erroneous for a party who by his own conduct deprives himself of the remedy available to him, cannot have a better right to a writ than a party who has not so deprived himself. Normally — and the present has not been shown to be other than a

normal case — a writ of mandamus is not issued if other remedies are available. There would be stronger reason for following this Rule where the obligation sought to be enforced by the writ is created by a statute and that statute itself provides the remedy for its breach.

16. This prior decision of the Central Government could be a reason for such departure only on the presumption that it would not change its view even if that view was shown to be incorrect. I cannot imagine that a court can ever make such a presumption. Therefore, it seems to me that it would have been proper to refuse the writ on the ground that the respondent had another remedy available to him which he had not pursued. On the present occasion, however, I do not wish to decide the case on that ground.”

32. I am in respectful agreement of the said view of Justice Sarkar.

33. Whether the Electoral Registration Officer erred in not appreciating the contentions urged by the petitioner regarding his entitlement to include his name in the electoral list notwithstanding the fact that Chief Executive Officer of Zilla Praja Parishad has not shown his name in the list of ZPTCs furnished by him can be urged in the appeal. Further, the Chief Executive Officer of Zilla Praja Parishad is inimical to him, that in view of the orders passed by this Court on 07.11.2014 in W.P.Nos.30790 and 30791 of 2014 and that the petitioner continues to be the member of ZPTC and Chairperson of Zilla Praja Parishad and, therefore, is entitled to include his name is an issue which can also be agitated before the appellate authority. His further contention that application for inclusion in the electoral list was submitted in time and there was no delay can also be urged in the appeal. It cannot be said that the appellate authority is not competent to consider all the contentions that can be urged before the appellate authority.

34. Thus, when petitioner has statutorily engrafted effective and efficacious remedy of appeal, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition against the decision of the Electoral Registration Officer refusing to include the name of the petitioner in the electoral list for the election to the member of Andhra Pradesh Legislative Council from Prakasam Local Authorities' Constituency.

35. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. In view of my decision on maintainability of writ petition, all issues raised in the writ petition are left open. The last date for inclusion of name in Electoral list for the Local Authorities Territorial Constituency, Prakasam is 16.6.2015. In view of the same, if petitioner prefers appeal immediately, the appellate authority shall consider and pass orders as warranted by law before 16.06.2015. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions if any pending in the writ petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

Date: 12.06.2015

Kkm

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.16354 of 2015

Date: 12.06.2015

kkm