

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

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.1344 of 2010

Between:
K.Lakshmi

....Petitioner

and

The Project Director of Indira Kranthi Pathakam (Urban),
O/o.Mission Director, MEPMA,
(Mission for Elimination of Poverty in Municipal Areas) 640,
A.C.Guards, Hyderabad – 500 004,
And others.

....Respondents

JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED ON : 06.04.2016

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO :

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers : Yes
may be allowed to see the Judgments?
2. Whether the copies of judgment may be : No
Marked to Law Reporters/Journals?
3. Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to : No
see the fair copy of the Judgment?

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

–

WRIT PETITION No.1344 of 2010

ORDER:

The petitioner claims to be a social worker who participated in various awareness programmes for the last 14 years before filing the Writ Petition. She was the first lady in the entire district to establish the DWCUA, DWGRA groups and she enrolled 16,000 women in the society for forming self help groups. She got several appreciation letters from the erstwhile Government of Andhra Pradesh. While so, the Central Government introduced the Indira Kranthi Pathakam, a scheme for

elimination of poverty in municipal areas. A paper notification was issued on 01.07.2009 inviting applications for the post of Poverty Resource Person and Community Organizer. In pursuance of the said notification, the petitioner submitted her application for the post of Community Organizer on 02.07.2009 and when no action was taken on the said application, the present Writ Petition was filed.

This Court, by order dated 20.04.2010, directed the respondents to consider the application purported to have been filed by the petitioner on 02.07.2009 seeking appointment as a Community Organizer in pursuance of the circular dated 18.07.2009 issued by the first respondent, if the petitioner is otherwise eligible for such age concession and pass appropriate orders within a period of eight weeks.

When the Writ Petition is taken up for consideration, learned Counsel for the petitioner is unable to submit to this Court with regard to the instructions he received from his client pursuant to the interim direction by this Court.

In the circumstances, in view of the interim direction dated 20.04.2010, recording the same as a final order, this Writ Petition is closed. The miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall also stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J)

06.04.2016

vs