

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

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF MAY,
TWO THOUSAND AND FIFTEEN

:PRESENT:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. RAMALINGESWARA RAO

WP .NO: 15102 of 2015

Between:

S. Ardik Agarwal, Son of G.S.K. Agarwal,
(Licensee of Miscellaneous Stalls in Mahabubnagar Railway Station and
Kurnool Railway Station) Resident of Kachepura Village, Mantralayam Road,
Kurnool District.

..... Petitioner

AND

- 1 Senior Divisional Commercial Manager, South Central Railway, Hyderabad
Division, Secunderabad.
- 2 Divisional Railway Manager, Commercial Branch, South Central Railway,
Hyderabad Division, Secunderabad.

.....Respondents

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein, the High Court may be pleased to issue a Writ, order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents not to evict the petitioner from his two miscellaneous stalls one is in Mahabubnagar Railway Station and another one in Kurnool Railway Station by declaring that the petitioner is entitled to renewal of his license for three more years and by declaring that the action of the respondents in trying to evict the petitioner from his two stalls without any notice and without passing any order on his renewal application is highly unjust, arbitrary, contrary to the terms and conditions of the license, illegal and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

The petition coming on for hearing, upon perusing the Petition and the affidavit filed herein and upon hearing the arguments of Sri C. Ramachandra Raju, Advocate for the Petitioner and Sri T.S. Venkata Ramana, Standing Counsel for the Respondents, the Court made the following

ORDER:

Mr.T.S.Venkata Ramana takes notice on behalf of respondents.

The writ petition is filed on the ground that the petitioner's possession of the shop is being disturbed when his representation is pending consideration before the authority. Learned Standing Counsel produced before me a copy of the order dated 21.05.2015 stating that his petition was rejected and it was served on the petitioner.

The service on petitioner is disputed by the learned counsel for the petitioner. Learned counsel for the petitioner wants to pursue and proceed against the respondents, in case the letter dated 21.05.2015 was not served on the petitioner by the time of filing the writ petition.

This Court at this stage cannot examine the said issue. Post on 02.06.2015.

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

For ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

To

- 1 The Senior Divisional Commercial Manager, South Central Railway, Hyderabad Division, Secunderabad.
 - 2 The Divisional Railway Manager, Commercial Branch, South Central Railway, Hyderabad Division, Secunderabad.
 - 3 One CC to Sri C. Ramachandra Raju, Advocate (OPUC)
 - 4 One spare copy.
- nnr

HIGH COURT

ARLR,J

DATED: 28-5-2015

NOTE: Post on 2-6-2015

ORDER

W.P.NO. 15102 OF 2015

DIRECTION

HIGH COURT

Nnr

Date of Drafting : 30-05-2015

ARLR,J

DATED: 28-5-2015

NOTE: Post on 2-6-2015

ORDER

W.P.NO. 15102 OF 2015

DIRECTION