

**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 MS.JUSTICE J. UMA DEVI**

WRIT PETITION No.32437 OF 2018

Between:

Battula Yadaiah S/o.late Sathaiah
R/o.Pasumamla village, Hayathnagar Mandal,
Rangareddy District.

... Petitioner

v.

Registrar (Vigilence),
High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad
for the State of Telangana and the State of
Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad and others.

.. Respondents

For Petitioner : M/s. Venkat Rao Patil

For Respondents : Smt. V. Uma Devi

Gist : सत्यमेव जयते

Head Note :

Cases Referred : Nil

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MS.JUSTICE J. UMA DEVI

WRIT PETITION No.32437 OF 2018

ORDER: (*per V. Ramasubramanian, J*)

The petitioner, who claims to have suffered certain orders in the hands of the judicial officer, who is arrayed as the 3rd respondent, has come up with the above writ petition, praying for the following relief:

“to issue a Writ order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of mandamus declaring the inaction on part of Respondents No 1 from reviewing the integrity and efficiency of the Respondent No 3 as expected by the people and for remaining mute spectator by leaving public duty to winds without playing proactive role in probing or enquiring into the allegations of corruption dishonesty wrong behavior unlawful behavior willful in character forbidden act recklessness carelessness and failure to do public duty judiciously which Respondent No 3 is obliged to perform under law and from initiating disciplinary action on the complaint dated 24082016 against her for the grave misconduct committed by her in discharging judicial functions as illegal arbitrary unconstitutional irrational whimsical or capricious against the Principles of Natural Justice and consequently direct the Respondent No 1 to initiate disciplinary action against Respondent No 3 in public interest.”

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. It appears that the grievance of the petitioner related to a suit that was dismissed by the learned Judge on 26.11.2015. The petitioner claims that he succeeded in the appeal. According to the petitioner, he has lodged two complaints, one on 26.11.2015 and another on 24.08.2016 and that no action was taken by the Registry.

4. Admittedly, the 3rd respondent is not working in the same District, but has been promoted and transferred to another District. In any case, we are not happy with the manner in which the prayer in this

writ petition is couched. While it is our duty to ensure that the litigants get a fair deal from every Court, we will have to ensure a balance in the sense that such complaints are not also used by unscrupulous litigants to hold the Judicial Officers to ransom. This balancing act can be done only on the administrative side and not on the judicial side.

5. Therefore, leaving it open to the petitioner to pursue his remedies on the administrative side of this Court, the writ petition is dismissed.

6. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

J. UMA DEVI, J

September 17, 2018.

KTL

