



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

[3331]

FRIDAY, THE FIFTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION NO: 11552/2013

Between:

1.Z.NAGESWARA RAO,, S/O. CHINNA RATAIAH, AGED ABOUT 24
YEARS, R/O. MADDALAKATTA VILLAGE, PEDDARAVEEDU
MANDAL, PRAKASAM DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR/DISTRICT PROJECT
COCOORDINATOR, NREGS, DWMA, ONGOLE, PRAKASAM
DISTRICT.

2.THE PROJECT DIRECTOR NREGS DWMA, ONGOLE, PRAKASAM
DISTRICT.

...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 an order or direction more particularly one in the nature Writ of Mandamus declaring the impugned orders vide Proceeding R.C.No.D4/517/2011, dated 04-07-2011 of the 2nd respondent, removing the petitioner from the service of Field Assistant, Maddalakatta village panchayat, Peddaraveedu Mandal, Prakasam District, without even considering the explanation and conducting any enquiry and further action of the 1st respondent in not considering the documentary proof in support of petitioner appeal dated 18-07-2011 simply rejected and confirmed the orders of the 2nd respondent, as illegal, arbitrary and violation of Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the

Constitution of India and consequently set aside the aforesaid impugned orders of the 2nd respondent

IA NO: 1 OF 2013(WPMP 14312 OF 2013)

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 suspend the operation of the impugned orders in Proceeding R.C.No.D4/517/2011, dated 04-07-2011 of the 2nd respondent

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.K RATHANGA PANI REDDY

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.GP FOR PANCHAYAT RAJ & RURAL DEV

The Court made the following:

::ORDER::

Sri Naga Phanindra, learned counsel representing Sri K.Rathanga Pani Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the cause in the writ petition does not survive and hence, the same is now rendered infructuous.

2. Recording the above submission, the Writ Petition is dismissed as infructuous. No order as to costs.

As a sequel, all the pending miscellaneous petitions shall stand closed.

SUBBA REDDY SATTI, J

Dated: 05.12.2025
SNI

335

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUBBA REDDY SATTI

WRIT PETITION No.11552 of 2013

Dated: 05.12.2025

SNI