

**HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT**

**WRIT PETITION No.34430 of 2016**

**O R D E R:**

Heard Mr.Tuhin Kumar, learned counsel for petitioner and Mr. R. Sudheer, learned Standing Counsel for Respondent No.3.

Petitioner challenges notice dated 24.09.2016 issued under Section 115(1) of the Andhra Pradesh Capital Region Development Authority, 2014. The notice has given seven days time to petitioner to give written explanation. The petitioner challenges notice by referring to some payment made towards regularization in the month of May 2016. After perusing the contents of impugned notice, this Court is not inclined to exercise writ jurisdiction and interdict the process set in motion by the competent authority. The petitioner has explanation, if any against the proposed action, the petitioner is entitled to file the reply and the respondents are under obligation to consider and take such other steps or decision as the circumstances warrant.

Without expressing any view on the merits canvassed by the petitioner or objections raised by the Standing Counsel, the Writ Petition is disposed of. Since a reply is already filed on 05.10.2016, the respondents are directed to consider the said reply of petitioner and take a decision expeditiously. No costs.

Consequently, Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand closed.

---

**S.V.BHATT,J**

06<sup>th</sup> October 2016  
ksld

