

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

***THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN**

and

***THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M. GANGA RAO**

+Writ Appeal No.1870 of 2017

Between:

#B. Sravya, W/o B. Raj Kumar, aged about 32 years,
Occ: Staff Assistant, The Karimnagar District
Cooperative Central Bank Limited, Jagityal Branch,
Karimnagar District, R/o H.No.7-7-187/3/F,
Mahalaxmi Nagar, Jagityal.

... Appellant

Vs.

The State of Telangana, represented by its
Principal Secretary to the Finance Department,
Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad and another

.. Respondents

! For Appellant : Mr. P. Narasimha,

^For Respondents : G.P. for Finance and Planning

Mr. P. Srinivas for R-2

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

AND

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M. GANGA RAO

Writ Appeal No.1870 of 2017

JUDGMENT: (V. Ramasubramanian, J)

Aggrieved by the dismissal of her writ petition challenging the order of suspension, the appellant has come up with the above writ appeal.

2. Heard Mr. P. Narasimha, learned counsel for the appellant.

3. The appellant was transferred from one branch to another by the proceedings dated 20-06-2017. The place to which the appellant was transferred is only 22 Kms away. But she applied for leave and did not report for duty. However, she came up with a writ petition and also made a representation.

4. The representations were considered and rejected even after which she did not join. Therefore, by an order dated 30-08-2017, the appellant was placed under suspension pending enquiry. Challenging the order of suspension, the appellant filed a writ petition, but the same was disposed of by the learned single Judge with a direction to the management to conclude the disciplinary proceedings within two months. Aggrieved by the said order, the appellant has come up with the above appeal.

5. The case of the appellant is that she was placed under suspension only on account of her not joining duty in the transferred place and that she is prepared to join duty. But this wisdom should have been downed upon the appellant much earlier.

6. Today, it is reported by the learned standing counsel for the respondent-bank that pursuant to the orders of the learned Judge, the enquiry itself has been completed and final orders are yet to be passed. Therefore, we find no reason to interfere with the order of the learned Judge. However, the management shall pass final orders as per the judgment of the learned single Judge and if any representation is made by the appellant in the meantime, the same may also be considered.

Hence, the writ appeal is dismissed.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.



V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

M. GANGA RAO, J

Date: 08-12-2017

Ksn