

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

**MONDAY, THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY TWO
THOUSAND AND SIXTEEN**

Present

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT

WRIT PETITION No.18710 of 2009

Between:

S.B. Ramakrishna Rao,
S/o. Late Satyanarayana,
Aged about 30 years,
Junior Assistant,
Sri Lakshmi Narasimha Swamy Vari Devastanam,
Yadagirigutta, Nalgonda District.

.. Petitioner

AND

The Commissioner, Endowments Department,
Tilak Road, Boggulakunta,
Hyderabad & 2 others

.. Respondents

The Court made the following:

—

—

—

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT

WRIT PETITION No.18710 of 2009

ORDER:

-

Heard Mr. Ravi Kondaveeti, learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Government Pleader for Endowments for the 1st respondent, Mr. Ch. Satish Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for the 2nd respondent and Mr. N. Guru Gopal, learned counsel for the 3rd respondent.

2. The petitioner, an employee working in the 2nd respondent temple, has filed this writ petition for *mandamus* declaring the action of respondents in not considering petitioner's case for promotion to the post of Senior Assistant in the 2nd respondent temple and promoting the 3rd respondent, who is junior to the petitioner and not qualified for promotion to the post of Senior Assistant vide proceedings Rc.No.B1/3798/2003, dated 27.08.2008, as illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional.

3. On 08.09.2009, this Court in W.P.M.P.No.24470 of 2009 directed as follows:

"There shall be a direction to the first respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 15.06.2009 and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of this order."

4. The 2nd respondent filed counter affidavit and annexures.

Briefly stated, the reply of the 2nd respondent is that there was a just reason for not considering the case of the petitioner for promotion either in the year 2008 or 2009, for according to the 2nd respondent, the petitioner acquired requisite qualifications in February, 2009. It is further stated that the case of the petitioner for promotion as Senior Assistant was considered and vide proceedings Rc.No.B1/821/2009, dated 01.04.2010, the petitioner was promoted as Senior Assistant. The petitioner was further promoted through proceedings No.B1/3798/2003, dated 19.08.2013, as Superintendent. The promotion to petitioner is given consequent upon reversion of the 3rd respondent, who could not acquire qualifications in terms of G.O.Ms.No.888, Revenue (Endowments-I) Dept., dated 08.12.2000. The above circumstances would go to show that the writ prayers do not survive and in my considered view, no further direction is required or the grievance of the petitioner required to be considered.

5. By placing on record the stand stated by the 2nd respondent, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand closed.

S.V. BHATT, J

Date: 15th February, 2016

KL



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT

-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-
-
-

-
-
-
-

-

-
-
-
-
-

-

-

WRIT PETITION No.18710 of 2009

-

Date: 15th February, 2016

KL