



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

[3459]

WEDNESDAY, THE THIRD DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE SUMATHI JAGADAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 20388/2010

Between:

1.M/S. MAHARAJA PULVARISING MILLS, MANGAMPET,,
OBULAVARIPALLI MANDAL, KADAPA DISTRICT, REPRESENTED
BY ITS SOLE PROPRIETRIX SHAIK ZAHARA BEE R/O.8/126,
ALMASPET, KADAPA.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE EMPLOYEES STATE INSURANCE CORPORATION,
REPRESENTED BY ITS REGIONAL DIRECTOR, BASHEERBAGH,
HYDERABAD.

2.THE RECOVERY OFFICER THE EMPLOYEES STATE INSURANCE,
CORPORATION, BASHEERBAGH, HYDERABAD.

...RESPONDENT(S):

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 action of the respondents in issuing warrant of attachment of immovable property in his 52, Q/9718-67, dt. 25.11.2009 by the 2nd respondent demanding Rs.5,61,718/- as on 30.11.2009 with further interest from the petitioner, though the petitioner is not in due, even without any notice, any enquiry and any determination as illegal, unjust, arbitrary, highhanded against the principle of Promissory Estoppel and beyond limitation and against the statutory provisions including Sec.45 B of the Employees State Insurance Act, 1948 and consequently set aside the warrant of

attachment of immovable property issued by the 2nd respondent in in his 52, Q/9718-67, dt. 25.11.2009 and consequently not to take any coercive action against the petitioner and pass.

IA NO: 1 OF 2010(WPMP 25919 OF 2010)

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 direct the respondents not to take any coercive action against the petitioner or her properties in pursuance of the warrant of attachment of immovable property issued by the 2nd respondent in his 52, Q/9718-67, dt. 25.11.2009, pending disposal of the above Writ Petition and pass.

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.L J VEERA REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.U.R.P. SRINIVAS

The Court made the following ORDER:

Though the matter was adjourned on 26.11.2025, there was no representation on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioner. Hence, the matter was listed today under the caption "for dismissal".

Today when the matter is called, there is no representation for the petitioner. It appears that the learned counsel for the petitioner is not interested to prosecute the case.

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

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE SUMATHI JAGADAM

Dated: 03.12.2025
RSD

57

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE SUMATHI JAGADAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 20388/2010

Dated: 03.12.2025
RSD