

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. SHANKAR NARAYANA**

WRIT PETITION No.19294 of 2009

Between:

T. Veeraiah Gupta

PETITIONER

And

1. The Chief Secretary, Goernment of A.P., Secretariat, Hyderabad,
and others.

RESPONSENTS

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. SHANKAR NARAYANA**

WRIT PETITION No.19294 of 2009

-

ORDER: (Per Hon'ble Sri Justice V. Ramasubramanian)

The petitioner has come up with the above writ petition by way of a Public Interest Litigation seeking to issue a Writ of Mandamus to direct the respondents to form a road between Vittalapuram and Uddandapuram on the road leading from Ileeja – Thumukunta – Vittalapuram – Itikyala, and National High Way No.7.

Heard Mr. T. Veeraiah Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj and Rural Development Department.

The writ petition was filed in the year 2009. The 8th respondent- Superintending Engineer filed a counter way back in November, 2009 contending that the villagers of Vittalapur, Mallamdoddi, Yelkur and Uddandapur are already connected by B.T. road to its Mandal Head Quarters, Market Centres, Health Centres by shortest possible roads. The 8th respondent has also stated that at that time there were two major grants for construction of roads in Panchayat Raj Department, i.e., PMGSY and NABARD. Though the office of the Superintending Engineer requested the Collector by letter dated 28.12.2006 for grant of administrative sanction either under RSVY or NFFW grant, the Chief Planning Officer rejected the proposal on the ground that sufficient funds were not available at that time. Therefore, the Superintending Engineer has stated in Paragraph-5 to his counter affidavit that at that time there were no sufficient funds and that the Government will

consider the matter as soon as sufficient budget was allotted to consider the request.

Now nearly 7 years have passed from the time when the counter affidavit was filed. It appears that there are new schemes in place as on date. It is also stated that the Superintending Engineer, who has sworn to the counter affidavit has now become the Engineer-in-Chief. Therefore, we are of the considered view that the writ petition could be disposed of directing the respondents to have a fresh look at the representation of the petitioner.

Accordingly the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondents to have a fresh look at the representation of the petitioner and if there are new schemes in place, take appropriate action in accordance with law. The petitioner shall send a fresh representation within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The respondents shall consider the same within a further period of three months. No costs.

As a sequel, pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

JUSTICE A. SHANKAR NARAYANA

8th June, 2016
Js.