

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

-

WRIT PETITION No.8725 of 2016

ORDER:

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

“It is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue a Writ, Order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the inaction of the Respondents 1 to 5 against the irregularities and illegalities committed in pooling of land for building the capital of Andhra Pradesh as illegal, arbitrary, contrary to the Rule of Law and also violation of article 14, 21, Representation of Peoples Act, 1951, Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. Consequently, direct the Respondent No. 6 to investigate this matter and pass such other order or orders may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”

Perusal of the pleadings however discloses that there is not even a whisper of an allegation as to any specific irregularities in the context of the Land Pooling Scheme in the State of Andhra Pradesh. The affidavit filed in support of the writ petition only launches a tirade against the named unofficial respondents and the attack appears to be that they have amassed wealth and immovable properties without lawful means.

Sri D.V. Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner, would however contend that a similar writ petition, W.P.No.29385 of 2010, was entertained by this Court on the basis of a letter addressed by a people's representative against Sri Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy, the present Leader of the Opposition in the State of Andhra Pradesh. Learned counsel further contends that as various departments of the State have been impleaded in this writ petition, that would be reason enough to entertain it.

This Court is however not persuaded to agree. It appears to be the attempt of the petitioner to initiate a roving enquiry against all and sundry and mention is made of alleged irregularities in the Land Pooling Scheme only for the purpose of maintaining this writ petition though the pleadings are completely unconnected thereto. Given the dichotomy between the two, the grounds urged by the learned counsel

are of no avail.

The writ petition is therefore dismissed.

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

JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

Date:21.03.2016

GJ