

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE THIRTIETH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND EIGHT

PRESENT
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY
WRIT PETITION NO : 18876 of 2005

Between:

Vavilala Venkatappyya Sastry S/o.Siatarama Sstry
Retd.Dy.G.M. ONGC R/o.Rajahmundry, East Godavari District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

- 1 Sri Bala Tripura Sundari and Visweswara Swami Vari Temple
Innispet, Rajahmundry, East Godavari District.
- 2 Deputy Commissioner of endowments Kakinada
East Godavari District.
- 3 Assistant Commissioner of Endowments Rajahmundry
East Godavari District.
- 4 Trust Board Sri Bala Tripura Sundari and Visweswara Swami
Vari temple Innispet, Rajahmundry, East Godavari District rep by
its new appointed Chairman, A.V.Ramana.

...RESPONDENTS

**Counsel for the Petitioner: MR K.V.A.RAMAPRASAD FOR
SRI.T.V.S.PRABHAKARA RAO**

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR ENDOWMENTS

The Court made the following :

ORDER:

-

This writ petition is filed for the following substantive relief:

“It is therefore prayed that this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue writ, order or direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents 2 and 3 in appointing the fourth respondent Trust Board to the first respondent temple de horsing the right of the petitioner, pending application to recognize as founder family trustee as illegal, arbitrary and violative of ruling of the Apex Court and also the mandatory provisions of the A.P. Charitable Hindu Religious Institutions and Endowments Act, consequently direct the second respondent not to permit the third respondent to function by granting stay of all further proceedings pursuant to the appointment of fourth respondent pending writ petition.”

At the hearing, it is admitted by Sri K.V.A.Rama Prasad, learned counsel representing Sri T.V.S.Prabhakara Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner, that in view of expiry of two years term, for which the Trust Board was constituted, the writ petition has become infructuous.

Hence, the writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

As a sequel to dismissal of main petition as infructuous, WVMP No.2696 of 2005 is disposed of as infructuous.

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY,J

Dated 30th June, 2008

vrn