

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

[Special Original Jurisdiction]

MONDAY THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF APRIL, 2016

PRESENT
HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT

WRIT PETITION NO. 19634 OF 2014

Between:

The Varalakshmi SC & ST Labour Contract
Co-operative Society Limited,
9th Ward, Markapur, Markapur town,
Prakasham district
Rep. by its President, Mangamuri Narsaiah Petitioner

V/s.

The Divisional Co-operative Officer,
Markapur, Prakasham district & Ors. ... Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner: Sri B. Sesi Bushan Rao

Counsel for the Respondents: GP for Co-operation

The court made the following: [order follows]

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT

WRIT PETITION NO. 19634 OF 2014

ORDER :

Heard Learned counsel appearing for petitioner, respondents 1, 3 and 5; and respondent No.2.

2. The petitioner challenges communication Rc.No.218/D, dated 30/6/2014 as illegal, arbitrary and violative of principles of natural justice.

3. The impugned communication as is evident is addressed by the first respondent to second respondent keeping second respondent posted of a few steps the first respondent has taken against Varalakshmi SC and ST Labour Contract Co-operative Society Limited/petitioner herein. According to petitioner, the proceedings is affecting the chances of petitioner getting labour contract from second respondent and hence the writ petition is filed on various factual and legal grounds stated in the affidavit.

4. The first respondent filed counter-affidavit and has set

out various options available to first respondent to proceed against petitioner-society and the stage of such enquiries. The first respondent further stated that the impugned proceedings is more intended to intimate the second respondent of these developments and no cause of action arises for the petitioner to challenge proceedings impugned in the writ petition. At the time of hearing, it is stated that if the second respondent on the application made by the petitioner exclusively by reference to the impugned proceedings declines to grant any benefit to which the petitioner-society is other wise entitled to, the petitioner-society can certainly work out its prayer within the four corners of law.

5. Learned counsel for petitioner fairly states that by placing on record the above statement and also giving liberty to petitioner to avail remedy against any adverse decision if taken by the second respondent, the writ petition can be disposed of.

6. Having regard to the limited submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, the writ petition is disposed of as indicated above. No costs.

7. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE S.V. BHATT

18/4/2016
IsL

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT

-

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

WRIT PETITION NO. 19634 OF 2014

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

Date: 18/4/2016
Circulation No.
Court Master: I s L