

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVILI

WRIT PETITION No.29291 of 2017

ORDER:

This writ petition is being disposed of at the admission stage with the consent of both parties.

2. This writ petition is filed seeking a writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the 2nd respondent in not considering the proceedings, dated 07.03.2017, for appointment of Language Telugu Pandit in DSC 2008, Ranga Reddy District as arbitrary, illegal, unconstitutional and against the principles of natural justice and sought a consequential direction to the 2nd respondent to consider the proceedings, dated 07.03.2017 for appointment of Language Telugu Pandit in DSC 2008 Ranga Reddy District.

3. Heard Sri Jagdish Kothapally, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Services-I appearing for the respondents.

4. It has been contended by the petitioner that he is fully eligible and qualified to be appointed to the post of Language Telugu Pandit and the petitioner has responded to the DSC 2008 in Ranga Reddy District. The grievance of the petitioner is that though he is fully eligible and qualified to the post of Language Telugu Pandit in DSC 2008, his case was not considered and he was not appointed to the said post. The petitioner submits that his case was not considered for appointment in Ranga Reddy District on the ground that a criminal

case in C.C.No.435 of 2010 in Crime No.48 of 2010 was pending before the IV Metropolitan Magistrate, Cyberabad at Ibrahimpatnam, at that relevant point of time and the competent criminal court was pleased to acquit the petitioner in C.C.No.435 of 2010 on 22.12.2016 and thereafter the petitioner has submitted a representation to the 3rd respondent and the 3rd respondent, vide proceedings, dated 07.03.2017, has recommended the case of the petitioner to the 2nd respondent. But, the 2nd respondent is not passing any orders on the said recommendations submitted by the 3rd respondent.

5. Therefore, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that appropriate orders be passed in the writ petition directing the 2nd respondent to pass appropriate orders on the recommendations made by the 3rd respondent, vide proceedings, dated 07.03.2017, and appoint the petitioner as Language Telugu Pandit.

6. Learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents submits that the case of the petitioner would be considered and the 2nd respondent would consider the proceedings, dated 07.03.2017, of the 3rd respondent and pass appropriate orders.

7. This Court, having considered the rival submissions of the learned counsel for respective parties, is of the considered view that this writ petition can be disposed of directing the 2nd respondent to consider the proceedings, dated 07.03.2017, of the 3rd respondent, for appointment to the post of language Telugu Pandit and pass

appropriate orders, in accordance with law, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8. With these observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed. No order as to costs.

ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVILI, J

8th July 2019

mar

