

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR
and
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M. SEETHARAMA MURTI

WRIT PETITION No.26562 of 2016

—
ORDER: (per SK, J)

The prayer of the petitioner in this case is as under:

“For the reasons stated in the affidavit accompanying, this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue a Writ, Order, or Direction, more particularly one in nature of Writ of MANDAMUS declaring the impugned proceedings No.3809/CPR&RESPONDENT/EI/2016 dated 6.7.2016, issued under rule 8(1)(b) of A.P.C.S. (CC&A) Rules 1991 as being contrary to the allegations made therein and set aside the same and consequently declare the action of the Hon’ble Tribunal in admitting the O.A.No.2858 of 2016 on the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad, without going into material placed on record and without application of mind, in the interest of justice and pass such other order or orders as this Hon’ble Court deems fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”

It is an admitted fact that the petitioner approached the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad (Tribunal) by way of O.A.No.2858 of 2016, and by order dated 22.07.2016, the Tribunal admitted the O.A. and ordered notice to the third respondent in the case. There is no adjudication by the Tribunal in the pending O.A., be it at the interlocutory or at the final stage, whereby the petitioner can maintain this writ petition before this Court. The law laid down by the Supreme Court in **L. Chandra**

Kumar v. Union of India^[1] bars the petitioner from doing so.

The writ petition is utterly misconceived and is accordingly dismissed.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall also stand dismissed. No costs.

SANJAY KUMAR, J

9th AUGUST, 2016.

M. SEETHARAMA MURTI, J

kvni

^[1] (1997) 3 SCC 261