

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, AT HYDERABAD  
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA & THE STATE OF ANDHRA  
PRADESH**

**\*\*\*\***

**HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 2555 OF 2017**

Between:

K. Kondal Rao S/o K. Muthaiah

....Petitioner

A n d

Telangana State Road Transport Corporation, represented by its  
Vice Chairman and Managing Director, Musheerabad, Hyderabad  
and one another.

....Respondents

**DATE OF ORDER: 27.01.2017**



**HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO****WRIT PETITION NO. 2555 OF 2017****ORDER:**

Petitioner is a Conductor. He was conducting vehicle bearing No. AP 28 Z 4269 on route No. 1 Z at about 14.00 hours on 20.12.2016. It appears that a check was conducted by the Zonal Enforcement Squad and in the said check it was found that a passenger was carrying re-issued ticket of Rs. 7/-. On the said allegation, disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the petitioner on 27.12.2016 and charge sheet was also issued and on the same day he was placed under suspension by the order impugned. Petitioner challenges the order of suspension in this Writ Petition.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that merely on the basis of presumption that a ticket was re-issued, suspension order was issued, which was unjustified. Suspending the petitioner on the apprehension that the passenger carried the re-issued ticket whereas the truth is otherwise and such action is arbitrary. The petitioner did not indulge in any cash and ticket irregularities as sought to be alleged.

3. It is not the case of the petitioner that the Depot Manager is not competent to place him under suspension.

4. A bare perusal of the order of suspension, it is clear that the competent authority has taken a decision to place the petitioner under suspension based on a report submitted by the Zonal Enforcement Squad of Hyderabad Zone informing the instant check conducted and finding that a passenger was traveling on re-issued ticket. Whether the allegation made against the petitioner is valid requires consideration in the pending disciplinary proceedings. It appears from the material papers enclosed to the Writ Petition that the petitioner submitted a representation on 7.1.2017 requesting the authorities to furnish certain documents for the purpose of submission of effective defense.

5. Having regard to these facts, this Court is not inclined to grant relief against suspension from service at this stage. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed leaving it open to the petitioner to work out his remedies as available in law against the disciplinary action initiated against him. It is needless to observe that the disciplinary authority shall complete the enquiry as early as possible. There shall be no order as to costs. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, pending if any, shall stand closed.

---

**P. NAVEEN RAO, J**

Date: 27.01.2017  
KA