APHC010567602022

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.453 of 2022

(O.A. No. 198 of 2019)

Between:

K. Paranjyothi, W/o. Vijay, Age: 37 years, Occ: Shroff, O/o. The Sub Registrar of Assurances, Nidadavolu, West Godavari 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.E1/343/2017-13, 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.453/2022, dated 09.07.2026, wherein it was stated that the individual was suspended from service in the stamps missing case at S.R.O., Tadepalligudem, vide District Registrar, Eluru, Proceedings No. E1 / 807 / 2021, dated 21.10.2021. The disciplinary authority framed charges against the individual and still the charges are pending against the individual. The Individual was reinstated into service vide District Registrar, Eluru, Proceedings No. E1 / 644 / 2021, dated 26.04.2022. The case of the petitioner for promotion as Junior Assistant would be considered only after finalization of the charges against her. 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 was not promoted in view of the pendency of the disciplinary proceedings, and therefore, she 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 her 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 she 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