

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.4917 of 2017

ORDER:

Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for respondent Nos.1 to 4.

This is an unusual case of Inspector of Police approaching this Court complaining against his superior, Superintendent of Police. The petitioner states that he belongs to Yerukula Community (Schedule Tribe) and he was facing harassment and suppression from upper caste community officers in the Department, which hindered his discharge of duties. The fifth respondent belongs to an upper caste community and the petitioner alleges that he was prejudiced against him. He narrates some incidents that have occurred recently in the month of November, 2016, while he was discharging the bandobast duties in Srisailem Temple. It is also his allegation that when the petitioner was working at Srisailem, the fifth respondent used to direct the petitioner to settle the civil disputes of his community and whenever he failed to do so, he used to abuse the petitioner over phone. He further states that he lodged a complaint on 02.02.2017 to the National Commission for Scheduled Tribes against the fifth respondent with a copy to respondent Nos.2 and 3. He filed the present Writ Petition challenging the action of respondent Nos.1 to 3 in not registering the said complaint, which was given by him to

the National Commission for Scheduled Tribes with a copy marked to them.

Today when the matter is listed for admission, the learned Government Pleader, on the basis of instructions, submits that an enquiry was already conducted by the fourth respondent and it is an internal departmental matter, which does not call for any interference from this Court.

The averments in the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition disclose that they relate to the discharge of duties of the petitioner on the directions of the fifth respondent under whom he was working and his grievance against the fifth respondent. This is purely a service dispute and it has to be resolved by the higher officer to whom the petitioner as well as the fifth respondent are subordinates.

Since the petitioner sent a copy of the complaint dated 02.02.2017 to the second respondent and it is not known whether the second respondent has taken cognizance of the said complaint or not, liberty is given to the petitioner to submit a representation to the second respondent within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, and on receipt of such representation, the second respondent shall take necessary action in accordance with law.

The Writ Petition is, accordingly, disposed of. The miscellaneous petitions pending in this Writ Petition, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J)

13.02.2017

Note: Issue C.C in two days.

B/o.

vs

