APHC010266562014

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3310]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY ,THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE K MANMADHA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 35567/2014

Between:

Smt.maadasu Bhushanamma, **...PETITIONER**

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. NAGARAJU NAGURU

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. G RAMANA RAO (SC FOR ENDOWMENTS RAYALASEEMAREGION)
2. V T M PRASAD
3. GP FOR ENDOWMENTS (AP)

The Court made the following Order:

This Writ Petitionis filed, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking the following relief:

> ***"....to issue appropriate Writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of WRIT OF MANDAUMS declaring the action of the Respondents in not considering representation of the petitioner Dt:11-02-2014 by considering her case on par with other tenants cultivating***

an extent of Ac.3.06¼ Cents in Survey No.202, Karamchedu Mandal, Jarubulavaripalem Village, Kodavalipalem Revenue Village, Prakasam District, as arbitrary, illegal and violation of Article 14, 19 & 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondents to declare the petitioner as a small farmer…."

2. Heard Ms.A.Vasavi, learned counsel representing Mr.Nagaraju Naguru, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.P.Srinivas, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Endowments, for the respondent(s).

3. On hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that they have given No-Objection Vakalat to the petitioner long back.

4. Upon perusal of the material on record, this writ petition is filed in the year 2014. After a lapse of 11 years, even the learned counsel for the petitioner on record has given No-Objection Vakalat to the petitioner, till date the petitioner has not taken any steps either to engage a new counsel or to appear in person to prosecute the case. It seems that the petitioner is not interested in prosecuting the case.

5. Therefore, the Writ Petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. There shall be no order as to costs. As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

Dr. K. MANMADHA RAO, J

BMS