

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

W.P.No.22887 OF 2006

ORDER

Sri M.Karuna Sagar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, learned Government Pleader for Urban Land Ceiling appearing respondents 1 and 2 and learned counsel appearing for the 5th respondent are present.

This writ petition is filed for the following relief:

“to issue a Writ, Order or Direction more especially one in the nature of Writ or Mandamus declaring G.O.Ms.No.1276 Revenue (CU-II) Department, dt. 2.9.2006 and G.O.Ms.No.1890 Revenue (UC-II) Department, dt.11.10.2005 allotting plot Nos.7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 in favour of the respondents 3 to 6 as arbitrary and illegal and without application of mind and set aside the same and pass such other order or orders as are deemed fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”

When the writ petition came up for consideration on 13.6.2017 at the interlocutory stage, WPMP No.31614 of 2009 filed for setting aside the order made in WVMP No.219 of 2007 in WPMP No.29130 of 2006, dated 06.10.2009, it was dismissed and as the writ petition is of the year 2006, it was directed to be listed after two weeks for hearing. Later, on 4.7.2017, one Smt T.Dhana Laxmi, learned counsel, representing learned counsel for the petitioner, sought adjournment and hence, the case was adjourned on payment of costs of Rs.500/-. Accordingly, the matter was listed on

11.7.2017 and learned counsel appearing for the petitioner appeared on that date and sought an adjournment on the ground that counter-affidavit was filed on that day only. Conceding the said request, the matter was adjourned to today under the caption 'for orders'.

Today, when the matter is listed, a request is made at 10.30 AM by the learned counsel for the petitioner seeking further adjournment, which was refused. He tried to meet me in the chambers during lunch time and the same was also refused. When the matter is taken up at 2.30 P.M, learned counsel stated that without getting instructions from his client, he cannot argue the matter.

In view of the same, this Court has no other option except to dismiss the case for non-prosecution.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. No costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

18th July, 2017
rkk

Note: Mark a copy to the Bar Council for examining whether the conduct of the counsel for petitioner is in tune with the provisions of the Advocate Act and the Rules made thereunder.