

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

THURSDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND SIXTEEN
(07.04.2016)

PRESENT
**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA
REDDY**
&
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K.JAISWAL

WRIT PETITION No.10646 of 2016

Between:

S.Srinivasa Rao

..... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep.by its
Principal Secretary, Revenue Department,
A.P.Secretariat, Hyderabad and 3 others

.....RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioner

: Mr.K.RAM REDDY

Counsel for Respondent Nos.1 to 3

: G.P.for Services (AP)

The Court made the following:

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA
REDDY**

&

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K.JAISWAL

WRIT PETITION No.10646 of 2016

JUDGMENT: (per Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy)

This writ petition is filed for certiorari to quash the order dated 25.01.2016, in O.A.No.7242 of 2015 on the file of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad (for short "the Tribunal").

In the manner the writ petition is proposed to be disposed of by this Court, it is not necessary to record detailed facts. Briefly put, the grievance of the petitioner is that though respondent No.3 has sent proposals for revising seniority in the cadre of Excise Inspectors as far back as November, 2013, respondent No.2 has not finalized the same and fixed the final seniority, and instead he is seeking to proceed with further promotions to the post of Excise Superintendents. The O.A. filed by the petitioner was dismissed on a technical ground.

When the writ petition came up before the court in the pre-lunch session, the case was passed over to enable the Government Pleader for Services (A.P) to secure the instructions as to the reason for not considering the proposals sent by respondent No.3 in November, 2013. In the post lunch session, the learned Government Pleader submitted that respondent No.2 is undertaking the exercise and he will complete the same within a reasonable time. She has further stated that till the proposals of respondent No.3 are not finalized, respondent No.2 will not

undertake the process of promotions to the posts of Excise Superintendents.

The above noted submissions of the learned Government Pleader are placed on record, and the writ petition is accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs.

As a sequel to disposal of the Writ Petition, WPMP No.13417 of 2016, filed by the petitioner for interim relief, is disposed of as infructuous.

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY,J

M.S.K.JAISWAL,J

Date: 07.04.2016

Dsr