

**WRIT PETITION NO: 18854 of 2005**

G. Tatababu

...Petitioner

Vs.

The Anakapalle Rural Electric Cooperative Society Ltd.

...Respondent

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. K. R. S. Prakash Rao appearing
vice Mrs. A. V. S. Laxmi

Advocate for Respondent : -

CORAM : SRI JUSTICE CHALLA GUNARANJAN**DATE : 17th February 2026****P C :**

The present Writ Petition is filed challenging the proceedings, dated 15.08.2005, issued by the sole respondent, by which the petitioner came to be temporarily suspended from the services, as being illegal, arbitrary and in violation of the principles of natural justice.

2. The petitioner claims to have been appointed as the Village Electricity Worker at Gandivanipalem, Dosuru Gram Panchayat, in pursuance to the proceedings *vide* Rc.No.RECS/KSK/Eng/Village Helpers/2000-01, dated 01.10.2001. Since then, he worked in the said capacity without any complaint from any quarters. However, to his surprise, by impugned proceedings issued by the Managing Director of the 1st respondent Society, he has been placed under suspension, however, on temporary basis.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the temporary suspension cannot be for an indefinite period and that too the petitioner has not been issued any show cause notice or charge memo alleging any irregularity and, therefore, without initiating an enquiry, the petitioner could not have been suspended for an indefinite period. He further contended that the very same Managing Director of the 1st respondent Society earlier too had issued proceedings, dated 16.04.2005, by which it was made clear that the petitioner be allowed to attend to duties, as there was never any resolution of Gram Panchayat, much less resolution, dated 13.03.2005, which recommended petitioner's suspension, pending enquiry.

4. None appears for the respondent, nor has any counter been filed.

5. As seen from the record and the impugned proceedings, the suspension ordered against the petitioner was purely temporary. Further, the references in the impugned proceedings indicate that there was an enquiry report, dated 11.08.2005, submitted by the Deputy Project Engineer, Paravada, and also an order, dated 15.08.2005, issued by the Managing Director of the 1st respondent, basing on which the impugned action was initiated. As rightly contended by learned counsel for the petitioner, the suspension cannot be for an indefinite period.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner also fairly states that he has no instructions from the client as to whether suspension has been revoked or not.

7. In that view of the matter, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of this writ petition by granting liberty to the petitioner to make a representation to the respondent seeking to restore him back to duty, if he is not otherwise allowed to resume duties by withdrawing the temporary suspension order. On such representation being made, the respondent is directed to consider it and pass appropriate orders within a period of four (4) weeks thereafter. It is made clear that any indefinite suspension would be unjustified and also contrary to the service jurisprudence.

8. Accordingly, the case of the petitioner be reviewed and appropriate orders be passed.

9. With the above observation, the writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

CHALLA GUNARANJAN, J

kbs

129

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE CHALLA GUNARANJAN

W.P.No.18854 of 2005

Date: 17.02.2026

kbs