APHC010567322022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

AT AMARAVATI **[3311]**

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

Tuesday, the thirteenth day of October, Two thousand and twenty Six

Present

The Honourable Ms. Justice B. S. Bhanumathi

Writ Petition (Transferred from APAT) No.451 of 2022

(O.A.No.196 of 2019)

Between:

Janapareddy Srinivasa Rao, S/o. Nageswara Rao, Age: 41 years, Occ: Junior Assistant, O/o the Sub Registrar of Assurances, Anathapalli on deputation to the office of the Director and I.G. of Registration & Stamps, Edupugallu, Krishna District.

….Petitioner

and

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, through its Special Chief Secretary, Revenue (Regn-I) Department, Secretariat Buildings, Velagapudi.
2. The Director and Inspector General, Registration & Stamps, A.P., Edupugallu, Krishna District.
3. The Deputy Inspector General, Registration & Stamps, Eluru.
4. The District Registrar, Eluru.

….Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner:

1. Amara Rama Rao

Counsel for the respondents:

1. G.P. for Services - I

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

This writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is filed with a prayer to set aside the Proceedings No.E1/343/2017-9, dated 02.02.2019, of the respondent No.4 reverting the applicant as Office Subordinate as arbitrary, illegal and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

2. The learned Government Pleader for Services-I placed on record a copy of the written instructions of the District Registrar, vide Letter No. WP (AT) No.451/2022, dated 09.07.2026, wherein it was mentioned that the petitioner was promoted as Junior Assistant and therefore, the grievance of the petitioner was resolved. A copy of the representation submitted by the petitioner to the District Registrar is enclosed to the written instructions, wherein it was stated that the petitioner got promoted and therefore, he is not interested in further prosecuting the writ petition.

3. The learned counsel for the writ petitioner submitted that there are no instructions from the petitioner despite the effort made to contact him over phone.

4. Since the writ petitioner is represented by the counsel, yet, the petitioner is not interested in prosecuting the petition, as it seems, and in view of the written instructions noted above, no further order is required.

5. As such, the Writ Petition is disposed of giving liberty to the petitioner to work out remedy, as per law, if he is still aggrieved.

There shall be no order as to costs.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

B.S. BHANUMATHI, J

Dt.13-10-2026
RAR