

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 45383 of 2016

Date : 20.3.2017

Between :

Katakam Laxma D/o late Kaitha Hanumanthu  
R/o 12-10-586/11/1/AE 1  
Medibavi Seetafalmandi, Secunderabad city

Petitioner

And

The State of Telangana  
Rep by its secretary,  
Environment, Forest, Electricity Science & Technology Dept  
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others

Respondents

The Court made the following:



HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 45383 of 2016

ORAL ORDER:

Petitioner claims that she is daughter of late Kaitha Hanumanathu. She challenges the appointment given to 6<sup>th</sup> respondent on compassionate grounds as dependent of her father.

2. According to the averments made in the writ petition, father of the petitioner, while working as Forest Watcher in the Forest Rest House, Kondimial, Karimnagar, died on 20.10.1992. 6<sup>th</sup> respondent claimed as adoptive son of late Kaitha Hanumanathu and secured employment in the year 1992. After long lapse, petitioner challenged the said appointment contending that 6<sup>th</sup> respondent is no way concerned with the family of late Kaitha Hanumanathu. It appears, petitioner filed a complaint before the police and the same is registered as Crime No. 88/2-11 of Karimnagar I Town police station. Since no action was taken on the said complaint, petitioner filed CrI M P No. 111 of 2014 and the same was allowed and CC No. 513 of 2015 was registered and pending on the file of Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Karimnagar. While so, petitioner also filed O A No. 966 of 2013 before A.P. Administrative Tribunal and the same was disposed of on 20.4.2016 with a direction to conduct enquiry with regard to relationship between 6<sup>th</sup> respondent and late Kaitha Hanumanathu and to pass necessary orders. In pursuance to the said direction, issue was considered and District Forest Officer by order dated 9.12.2016, rejected the claim of the petitioner. Said order is impugned in this writ petition.

3. Reading of the impugned order would show that even though sufficient opportunity was given to the petitioner, she did not produce any material in support of her claim that 6<sup>th</sup> respondent is not adoptive son of late Kaitha Hanumanathu. It appears 6<sup>th</sup> respondent filed O.S. 428 of 1991 on the file of the Additional First Class Magistrate at Karimnagar and a decree was

passed on 29.4.1991 declaring the 6<sup>th</sup> respondent as adoptive son of late Kaitha Hanumanathu and the said order has become final. Prima facie, this would show that 6<sup>th</sup> respondent is son of late Kaitha Hanumanathu.

4. Having regard to the findings of the District Forest Officer and fact that the claim of 6<sup>th</sup> respondent on compassionate grounds is questioned after 16 years, I do not see any merit in the writ petition. Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed. However, since C C No. 513 of 2015 before the Court of Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Karimnagar is pending, it is open to petitioner to work out her remedies, if competent Court holds against 6<sup>th</sup> respondent. No costs. Having regard to the same, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, are closed.

DATE:20.3.2017  
TVK

P NAVEEN RAO,J



125

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 45383 of 2016

Date : 20.3.2017