

***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. UMADEVI**

+Writ Petition No.36744 of 2017 & Writ Appeal No.1848 of 2017

W.P.No.36744 of 2017

Between:

M. Chandra Sekhar, S/o late Sri M. Venkatachary,
aged 55 years, Occ: Addl. Superintendent of Police,
Intelligence Department, Telangana State, Hyderabad

... Appellant

Vs.

The State of Telangana, represented by its
Principal Secretary, Home (Services-I) Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and another

.. Respondent

W.A.No.1848 of 2017

Between:

M. Chandra Sekhar, S/o late Sri M. Venkatachary,
aged 55 years, Occ: Addl. Superintendent of Police,
Intelligence Department, Telangana State, Hyderabad

... Appellant

Vs.

The State of Telangana, represented by its
Principal Secretary, Home (Services-I) Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and another

.. Respondent

! For Appellant : Mr. M. Surender Rao, learned Sr. counsel

^For Respondents : G.P. for Home (TG)

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

AND

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE J. UMADEVI

Writ Petition No.36744 of 2017 and W.A.No.1848 of 2017

COMMON JUDGMENT: (V. Ramasubramanian, J)

The writ appeal arises out of an order passed by the learned Judge not granting the interim relief that the writ petitioner actually wanted, but issuing a direction which is not to the satisfaction of the writ petitioner.

2. Considering the limited nature of the grievance, we directed the writ petition also to be tagged along with the writ appeal and taken up both the cases.

3. Heard Mr. M. Surender Rao, learned senior counsel appearing for the writ petitioner and the appellant and the learned Special Government Pleader attached to the office of the learned Additional Advocate General for the respondents.

4. In view of the fact that we are disposing of the writ petition itself, the writ appeal is closed without any orders.

5. The petitioner was issued with a charge memo for a minor penalty proceeding on 24-06-2017. The petitioner submitted an explanation on 28-06-2017. Nearly a period of six months have passed, though the proceedings are only for a minor penalty.

6. It is seen from the endorsements made on explanation submitted by the petitioner through proper channel that two officers, one of whom is the I.G. (Intelligence) himself has recommended that the charge may not be true.

7. Therefore, there should be no difficulty in disposing of the charge memo at an early date. The petitioner's case for promotion to the next higher grade, is put on hold because of this charge memo.

8. Therefore, the writ petition is disposed of directing the 1st respondent to pass final orders on the charge memo dated 24-06-2017 within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order, failing which his case may have to be considered for promotion without reference to the charge memo.

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

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

J. UMADEVI, J

Date: 02-01-2018

Note: Issue C.C. tomorrow.

B.O./Ksn

