



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

FRIDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF NOVEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 19956 OF 2017

Between:

1. V KRANTHI KUMAR, KADAPA DIST, S/o.V. Govindu, aged 29 years, R/o.
D.No. New G Type 217, RTPP Colony, Kalamalla, Kadapa District.

...Petitioner

AND

1. MD APGENCO HYDERABAD ANOTHER, Rep. by its Managing Director,
Vidyut Soudha, Hyderabad.

2. The Chief General Manager HR, The Andhra Pradesh Power Generation
Corporation, Vidyut Soudha, Hyderabad.

...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 a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus declaring the impugned action of the respondents in not awarding 2 marks on the basis of year of passing of ITI i.e. July, 2006 upto the date of Supplementary Notification dated 17-10-2011 in respect of selection of post of Junior Plant Attendant notified vide notification No.01/CGWHR/2010, dt. 05-01-2011 and Supplementary Notification No.01/CGM(HR)/2011, dt.17-

10-2011 as highly illegal, arbitrary and violative of Article 14 and 16 of Constitution of India

IA NO: 1 OF 2017(WPMP 24413 OF 2017)

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 to direct the respondents to consider for awarding marks for year of passing of ITI from July, 2006 up to the date of supplementary notification, pending disposal of the above writ petition

Counsel for the Petitioner: G V SHIVAJI

Counsel for the Respondents: K ARUNA

**Counsel for the Respondents:K.KRISHNABUSHAN CHOWDARY SC For
APGENCO**

The Court made the following ORDER:

When the matter is taken up for hearing, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that in view of the subsequent events taken place in the lis, the cause in the writ petition does not survive for further adjudication.

2. Recording the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

There shall be no order as to costs. As a sequel, all pending applications shall stand closed.

JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

Date: 07.11.2025
Dvs

103

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION No.19956 of 2017

Date: 07.11.2025

Dvs