



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

[3332]

THURSDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI

WRIT PETITION NO: 25897/2002

Between:

1.P.MURALI KRISHNA, S/O. NAGAPPA, TRACER, A.P.STATE IRRIGATION
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED, (A P S I D C L) ANANTAPUR.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.A P STATE IRRIGATION DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED, REP.
BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, MAITRIVANAM, HUDA COMPLEX,
SRINIVAS NAGAR COLONY (EAST),

2.THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, A.P.STATE IRRIGATION DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION LIMITED, ANANTAPUR.

3.GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, P.E.DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, 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 orders or directions particularly in the nature of Writ of Mandamus to call for the records pertaining to order Lr.No.IDC/MD/ADM/S.2/ADO.4/E.23/42/B5/Vol.2/3768 dt.8/9.11.2002 and Lr.No.IDC/MD/ADM/S2/AS04/E23/42/85/Vol. 11/3174 dt.27.9.2002 Lr.No.IDC/MD/ADMN/S.2/ASO.4/E.23/42/85 Vol. 2/5057 dt. 5.2.2001/6.2.2001 issued by the 1st respondent and set aside the same as illegal, arbitrary, contrary to law, much less violative of principles of natural justice, violative of Art. 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India besides contrary to the service regulations of the Corporation and consequently directing the respondents to reinstate the applicant in accordance with the provisions under Chapter II Rule

13 in the interest of justice with all consequential, monetary, service and other benefits in the interest of justice and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2002(WPMP 32721 OF 2002

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 expedite for final hearing at an early date in the month of February 2003 and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. M V RAJA RAAM

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1..

2. MALLIPUDI DHANA RAJU SC for APIDC Ltd.

The Court made the following order:

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the writ petitioner is not in touch with them and could not get instructions from him.

2. When the matter is pending consideration, the parties shall invariably pursue the matter. In the present case, the parties are not in touch with the counsel which shows that they are not having interest in prosecuting the matter and the writ petition is liable to be dismissed for non-prosecution.

3. Accordingly, this Writ petition is ***dismissed for non-prosecution***. If at all the petitioner feels that cause in this writ petition survives, he can move an appropriate application within two(02) months. No costs.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.