APHC010364232021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3333]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE 29th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

WRIT PETITION NO: 22803/2021

Between:

1. ANDHRA PRADESH ADVOCATES WELFARE JOINT ACTION COMMITTEE, (APAW-JAC), REP. BY ITS CHAIRPERSON A.P. LALY, D/O A.K. PAPACHAN, AGED ABOUT 53 YEARS, ADVOCATE (AP/1437/2008), R/O R.T.C. COLONY, GUNTUR TOWN, GUNTUR DISTRICT.

2. RADHA KUMARI, B W/O SATYANARAYANA, AGED 52 YEARS, ADVOCATE (AP/3075/2010), R/O LIGH - 122, VUDA COLONY, RAJEEV NAGAR, PAYAKAPURAM, VIJAYAWADA, KRISHNA DISTRICT.

3. SUNKESULA PANEENDRA NATH, S/O PARTHA SARATHI, AGED 44 YEARS, ADVOCATE (AP/862/2013), R/O H.NO.18-87, BONTHALA STREET, NANDYAL, KURNOOL DISTRICT.

4. YEDLA ADINARAYANA, S/O YEDLA CHANDRA RAO, AGED ABOUT 47 YEARS, ADVOCATE (AP/1358/2007), R/O INDIRA NAGAR COLONY, RAJUPALEM, P GANNAVARAM MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER(S)

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, LAW DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR DISTRICT,

REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.

2. ANDHRA PRADESH STATE BAR COUNCIL, HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, HIGH COURT BUILDINGS, NELAPADU, GUNTUR DISTRICT, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY

...RESPONDENT(S):

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 tomay be pleased to issue a Writ of MANDAMUS, declaring the action of the Respondents herein in not considering and passing appropriate orders on the representation made by the Petitioners on 13.08.2021 (posted on 14.08.2021), received by the Respondents on 16.08.2021, as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Article 14, 39A and 41 of Constitution of India and Consequently direct the Respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on the representation made by the Petitioners on 13.08.2021, forthwith and to pass such

IA NO: 1 OF 2021

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased may be pleased to direct the Respondents herein to consider and pass appropriate orders on the representation made by the Petitioners on 13.08.2021, received by the Respondents on 16.08.2021, pending disposal of the above Writ Petition and pass such

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1. GANIPALLI BHSHANAM

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. G VENKATA REDDY
2. GP FOR LAW LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

This Writ Petition came to be filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking the following prayer:

> "…to issue a Writ of MANDAMUS, declaring the action of the Respondents herein in not considering and passing appropriate orders on the representation made by the Petitioners on 13.08.2021 (posted on 14.08.2021), received by the Respondents on 16.08.2021, as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Article 14, 39A and 41 of Constitution of India and Consequently direct the Respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on the representation made by the Petitioners on 13.08.2021, forthwith and to pass such…"

2. The 1st petitioner herein is a joint forum established for the sole purpose of achieving welfare to the disqualified/discriminated advocates on the basis of their age in particular and other welfare activities related to advocates fraternity. It is the case of the petitioners that they submitted a representation to the respondents herein on 13.08.2021, with a request to pass necessary resolution to the effect of enabling the advocates who are enrolled/to be enrolled after the age of 35 years, to become members of Advocates' Welfare Fund by making necessary amendment to Section 15 of the Andhra Pradesh Advocates' Welfare Fund Act, 1987 (Act 33 of 1987) as amended by Act 1 of 2006, in larger public interest and to ensure equal justice to the advocates.

3. However, as the respondents have not passed any order on the representation dated 13.08.2021 in spite of receiving the same on 16.08.2021, the present writ petition is filed.

4. In spite of several adjournments, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioners. During the course of hearing, Sri. G. Venkata Reddy, learned counsel for the 2nd respondent, on oral instructions, submitted that the representation dated 13.08.2021 submitted by the petitioners is still pending consideration and that the 2nd respondent would pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

5. In view of the fact that the writ petition is filed aggrieved by the inaction of the 2nd respondent in passing appropriate orders pursuant to the representation dated 13.08.2021, instead of keeping the writ petition pending, this Court feels it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition by directing the 2nd respondent to pass appropriate orders on the representation dated 13.08.2021 submitted by the petitioner, within a period of four (4) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, in accordance with law.

6. Accordingly, with the above direction, this writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

Consequently, Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

Date:29.10.2026
Gss