

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT

WRIT PETITION No.3224 of 2008

ORDER:

Heard Sri K.Aroor holding for Sri Kowturu Vinayakumar, the Assistant Government Pleader for Social Welfare and Sri Ravindranath.

The petitioner prays for Mandamus declaring the action of 4th respondent in not renewing the petitioner's Mahila Pradan Kshetriya Bachat Yojana Agency and S.A.S.Agency as per 1st respondent's order in Memo No.8/A1/SS/2006, dated 02-06-2006, as illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional.

On 18-02-2008, by following the order issued by this Court, the interim direction as prayed for was granted.

The 3rd respondent filed counter affidavit and in paragraph '10' replied thus:-

"It is humbly submitted that after filing the renewal application by the petitioner to the 4th respondent, on 11-02-2008, and to comply with the interim orders of the Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh judicature in W.P.M.P.No.4203 of 2008, the agency have renewed vide this office Progs.Pc.No.NSS/914/2008, dated 17.03.2008."

Sri Ravindranath refers to a decision of this Court in W.A.No.576 of 2007 dated 16-07-2007 and submits that the Court in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India ought not to interfere with the policy decisions taken by the Government or

alternatively suggest mode and manner of implementing the policy decision taken by the Government.

As the learned counsel insisted that the argument put forward by him is adverted to, the same is referred to in the order.

This Court is of the view that as the writ prayer is against inaction, the interim order was granted on 18-02-2008.

The 3rd respondent, if had any difficulty in implementing the interim direction, ought to have filed counter and also a petition to vacate the interim order. On the other hand, the 3rd respondent issued proceedings dated 17-03-2008. Thus, with the issuance of proceedings dated 17-03-2008, the inaction complained in the writ petition is worked out.

In view of the stand taken in the counter affidavit, counsel for petitioner does not press the inaction complained in the writ petition.

The statement of learned counsel for petitioner is placed on record.

The writ petition is closed, as no further order is necessary. No order as to costs.

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

S. V. BHATT, J

Dt: 06-03-2017

Prv

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V.BHATT



06-03-2017

Prv