

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA : HYDERABAD

MAIN CASE No.: W.P.No.28994 of 2023

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. NO.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	05.08.2025	<u>SN, J</u> Heard Sri Kadire Krishnaiah, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that notice had been served on the 6th respondent and to that affect a memo had also been filed vide S.R.No.117818 of 2023 duly enclosing the track consignment details evidencing the fact of the service of notice upon the 6th respondent herein. However, when the case is called today i.e., on 05.08.2025, there is no representation on behalf of the 6th respondent nor the 7th respondent who are the contesting respondents in the present case. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the order impugned dated 04.10.2023 terminating the petitioner from service after the petitioner had put in more than a decade of service as Data Entry Operator working in the 7th respondent herein unilaterally in	Transferred to i/o folder before corrections, if any.

	clear violation of principles of natural justice without putting the petitioner on notice based on the letter dated 19.09.2023 forwarded by the Commissioner of Police, Khammam addressed to the District Collector, Khammam and also the letter dated 04.10.2023 of the 6th respondent addressed to the 7th respondent herein informing the 7th respondent that an FIR No.121 of 2023 dated 10.09.2023 had been registered against the petitioner at police station Kalloor, Khammam District, Telangana and on the ground of criminal case being registered against the petitioner, the order impugned had been passed terminating the petitioner from the service. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner further submits that the said FIR No.121 of 2023 dated 10.09.2023 is a false case registered against the petitioner by one Venkata Satya Narayana Reddy Putchakayalu who had been in fact the accused in the complaint registered by the petitioner against him vide FIR No.125 of 2022 dated 20.05.2022 and the FIR registered against the petitioner dated 10.09.2023 is in fact a	
--	---	--

	counterblast to the FIR registered against the said Venkata Satya Narayana Reddy Putchakayalu, by the petitioner herein only to wreak vengeance against the petitioner herein and there is no truth in the said case registered against the petitioner and that mere registration of FIR against the petitioner cannot be a ground to terminate the petitioner from service unilaterally after petitioner had put in more than a decade of service without any complaint from the 6th respondent herein. <u>The Apex Court in judgment reported in 2013 (15) SCC page 570 in "Sumit Mehta v State of NCT of Delhi" at paragraph 13 observed as under:</u> "The law presumes an accused to be innocent till his guilt is proved. As a presumable innocent person, he is entitled to all the fundamental rights including the right to liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India." For the submissions of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the 6th respondent, list the matter on 11.08.2025 under the caption <u>"For Orders"</u>. YVKR/GGD SN,J	
--	---	--