

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

TUESDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF MARCH TWO THOUSAND AND
SIXTEEN

-
Present

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.V.SESHA SAI

-
WRIT PETITION No.7314 of 2016

Between:

Smt. K. Santhi Kumari,
W/o. Mangi Reddy,
E.602284, Conductor,
A.P.S.R.T.C., Ramachandrapuram Depot,
Age: 29 years, R/o. Ramachandrapuram,
E.G. District.

.. Petitioner

AND

The Depot Manager,
A.P.S.R.T.C.,
Ramachandrapuram Depot,
East Godavari District & 2 others

.. Respondents

The Court made the following:

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

-
-

-
-
-
-
-
-
-

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.V.SESHA SAI

WRIT PETITION No.7314 of 2016

-

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the following relief:

“to issue a Writ or Order or Direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the Proceedings No.02/95(03)/2016/RCPM, dt. 23.02.2016 issued by the 1st respondent as illegal, arbitrary, void and against to the principles of natural justice.”

2. Heard Sri T.S. Venkata Ramana, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri S.V. Ramana, learned Standing Counsel for respondents 1 to 3.

3. According to the petitioner, she was appointed as a Conductor in the year 2010 and her services were regularised in the year 2013. By virtue of the impugned order, dated 23.02.2016, the Depot Manager, A.P.S.R.T.C., Ramachandrapuram Depot, East Godavari District (1st respondent) placed the petitioner under suspension.

4. It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that in the facts and circumstances of the case, the impugned suspension order is unwarranted and it is highly illegal and arbitrary.

5. On the contrary, it is contended by the learned Standing Counsel that in the absence of any jurisdictional error, the petitioner is not entitled for any relief from this Court under Article 226 of the

Constitution of India as the impugned suspension is only pending enquiry. Though a number of contentions have been raised in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, this Court is not inclined to meddle with the impugned suspension order at this stage, as the suspension order has been issued by the 1st respondent obviously pending enquiry.

6. Having regard to the nature of controversy, this Court is of the considered opinion that the ends of justice would be met if the respondents are directed to complete the enquiry within some time frame.

7. Therefore, for the aforesaid reasons, the Writ Petition is disposed of directing the respondents herein to complete the enquiry proceedings initiated against the petitioner pursuant to the impugned suspension order, dated 23.02.2016, within a period of two (2) months from the date of receipt of copy of this order, subject to the co-operation of the petitioner in the enquiry proceedings. It is also made clear that in the event of failure to complete the enquiry as directed above, the petitioner herein shall be reinstated into service. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand closed.

A.V.SESHA SAI, J

Date: 8th March, 2016

Note: Issue C.C. in three (3) days.

(B/o.)
KL

 **HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.V.SESHA SAI**

—

KL