

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S. V. BHATT

WRIT PETITION No.19146 of 2006

ORDER:

Heard Mr.Koti Reddy for petitioner and the Assistant Government Pleader for School Education.

The petitioner was working as Cooking agent of M.P.Elementary School, Muvvavaripalem. The villagers of Muvvavaripalem complained against the quality of food supplied by petitioner. The Mandal Revenue officer entrusted the matter to the Mandal Revenue Inspector to conduct preliminary enquiry and submit report. The Mandal Revenue Inspector submitted report, dated 04.02.2006. Basing on the complaint received from villagers and also the report, the petitioner was put on notice, explanation received, which resulted in issuing proceedings Pc.No.C/ 34/ 2006, dated 25.04.2006 terminating the agency of petitioner as cook of the School, referred to above. The petitioner filed appeal before the 1st respondent. The 1st respondent, after perusing the record and taking note of the substance of allegations against the petitioner, dismissed the appeal. Hence, the writ petition.

Mr.Koti Reddy contends that without affording opportunity to petitioner, the orders terminating the cooking agency were passed. Therefore, the orders are liable to be set aside and the petitioner be reinstated as cooking agent.

The contention is merely noted to be rejected. The order of 2nd respondent refers to preliminary enquiry, issuing show-cause notice, receiving explanation and thereafter, on being satisfied, the order

terminating the petitioner as cooking agent was passed. The 1st respondent, after perusing the file, was satisfied that no ground is made out for interfering with the order terminating the cooking agency of petitioner. The respondents are implementing a welfare scheme for the benefit of students studying in rural areas. The scheme is not implemented for the benefit of petitioner. The petitioner is only an instrument in attaining satisfactory results from the Scheme implemented by the Government. The respondents as the principal implementing agency, if are satisfied that the petitioner is not discharging the responsibility entrusted to her, to the extent required have enquired into the matter, terminated the agency of petitioner.

In cases of this nature, the scope of judicial review in the considered view of this Court is very limited and after perusing the orders, referred to above, I am satisfied the writ prayer does not warrant interference.

The writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending, shall stand closed.

S. V. BHATT, J

Dt: 12.02.2018
Prv

