

APHC010174862006



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

TUESDAY, THE SECOND DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA

WRIT PETITION NO: 19930 OF 2006

Between:

1. Dr.P.Pasibushana Rao,, s/o Late Sanyasi Naidu, Deputy Civil Surgeon
(Retired)CHC., Pathapatnam, Srikakulam District.

...Petitioner

AND

1. The Director of Health Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.
2. The Government of A P rep by its Principal Secretary, to Medical and Health, Secretariat, 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 an appropriate writ, order or direction particularly one in the nature of writ of certiorari calling for the records relating to and connected with the judgment in O.A.No.4194/2001, dt.7-10-2005 and quash the same including Rc.No.19005/E8C/1994 dt.20-04-2001 as arbitrary, illegal, contrary to rules and in discrimination and consequently direct the respondents to fix the seniority of the petitioner from 17-09-1972 i.e., the date of joining in Panchayath Raj Department with all consequential benefits and pass such

other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

IA NO: 1 OF 2006(WPMP 25152 OF 2006

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 fix an early date for final disposal of the Writ Petition and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

Counsel for the Petitioner: S SIVA PRASAD

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR MED HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

The Court made the following order:

ORDER: (Per Hon'ble Sri Justice Cheekati Manavendranath Roy)

Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing, there is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Earlier also, *inspite* of the fact that the matter is ordered to be listed under the caption 'for dismissal', petitioner did not turn up for hearing.

Therefore, it is evident that the petitioner is not evincing any interest to pursue this Writ Petition.

Therefore, Writ Petition is dismissed for non prosecution. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, Miscellaneous Applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

CHEEKATI MANAVENDRANATH ROY, J

TUHIN KUMAR GEDELA, J

02nd December, 2025
Tsy