HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

FRIDAY, THE ELEVENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NAMAVARAPU RAJESHWAR RAO

WRIT PETITION (TR) NO: 463 OF 2017

Between:

Mohd. Iqbal, S/o Md. Haneef, Aged about 58 years, working as Asst., City Planner (In-charge), GHMC (East Zone), Hyderabad. R/o Shanti Nagar, Masab Tank, Hyderabad

...PETITIONER

AND

1. The Commissioner, GHMC, Hyderabad.
2. The Additional Chief City Planner, O/o Chief City Planner, MCH(GHMC), Hyderabad-50001.
3. The Government of A.P., rep by its Principal Secretary to MA and UD (F) Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad-500022.
4. Sri M.A.Sami, working as Assistant Town Planner, GHMC, Hyderabad-500001.
5. Smt C.Sita Kalyani, Working as Assistant Town Planner, GHMC, Hyderabad-500001.

...RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue to call for the records relating to and in connection with the impugned charge Memo issued in G.O.Rt.No.285, dt.18.03.2004 of the 3rd respondent and impugned proceedings in U.O.Note.No.124/TPS/TP3/HO/2005/4634 dt.16.12.2005 issued by the 2nd respondent and also impugned G.O.Rt.No.495, dt.06.04.2013 issued by the 3rd respondent and set-aside the same by declaring them as illegal, arbitrary, violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India and consequently, direct the Respondents, to drop the disciplinary proceedings against the applicant and further promote the Applicant to the post of Assistant City/Town planner on par with his juniors with all service and monitory benefits.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SMT. ARUNA FOR SRI POODATTU AMARENDER
Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1,2,4 & 5: SRI L.DAYAKAR REDDY, SC FOR GHMC
Counsel for the Respondent No.3: GP FOR MPCL ADMN & URBAN DEV

The Court made the following: ORDER

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAMAVARAPU RAJESHWAR RAO

WRIT PETITION (TR) No.463 of 2017

ORDER:

Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing Smt. Aruna, learned counsel, representing Sri P.Amarender, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the subject matter of this writ petition has become infructuous.

2. In view of the above submission, the present writ petition is dismissed as infructuous. No order as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, in this Writ Petition, shall stand closed.

SD/- A. SREENIVASA REDDY
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To

1. One CC to SRI POODATTU AMARENDER, Advocate [OPUC]
2. One CC to SRI L.DAYAKAR REDDY, SC FOR GHMC [OPUC]
3. Two CCs to GP FOR MPCL ADMN & URBAN DEV, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad. [OUT]
4. Two CD Copies


PSK.
SS
PMG.

HIGH COURT

DATED:11/04/2025

ORDER

WP(TR).No.463 of 2017



DISMISSING THE WRIT PETITION (TR) AS INFRUCTUOUS WITHOUT COSTS

(7) PMG.
20/5/25