IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE THIRTY FIRST DAY OF MARCH TWO THOUSAND AND NINE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI ANIL R. DAVE, THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

WRIT PETITION NO: 6617 of 2009

Between:

P.V. Krishnaiah, S/o. Late Sri Lakshmi Narasimham,

R/o. lyengar Plaza Complex, Bank Street, Koti, Hyderabad.

PETITIONER

AND

- 1 Union of India, Rep by its Cabinet Secretary, New Delhi.
- 2 The Central Bureau in Investigations, Rep by its Director, New Delhi.
- 3 The Election Commission of India, Rep by its Chief Election Commissioner, Nirvachan Sadan, Parliament Street, New Delhi
- 4 State of A.P. Rep by its Chief Secretary, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
- 5 The Director General of Police, Anti Corruption Bureau, Hyderabad.
- 6 The Director General & Inspector General of Police, Govt. of A.P. Hyderabad.
- 7 Dr. Y.S. Rajasekhara Reddy, Hon'ble Chief Minster, Govt. of A.P. Hyderabad.
- 8 The Telugu Desam Party, Rep by its President, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad.
- 9 The Communist Party of India (Marxist) MB Bhavan, Musheerabad,

Hyderabad, Rep. by its Secretary

- 10 The Communist Party of India, Maqdoom Bhavan, Himayatnagar, Hyderabad, Rep. by its Secretary
- 11 The Bharatiya Janata Party, M.J. Road, Hyderabad, Rep. by its President
- 12 The Telangana Rashtra Samithi, Banjara Hills, Hyderabad, Rep. by its President

- 13 The Praja Rajyam Party, Jubilee Hills, Rep by its President, Hyderabad.
- 14 The Loksatta Party, Basheerabagh, Hyderabad, Rep by its President
- 15 The Anhdra Jyothi Telugu Daily, Plot No. 76, Aswani Layout, Huda Hights, Road No. 70, Jubilee Hills, Hyderabad- 33, Rep by its Managing Director
- 16 The Eenadu Telugu Daily, 6-3-569/3, Eenadu Complex, Somajiguda,

Hyderabad - 82, Rep. by Editor

....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ order or direction in the nature of Mandamus or otherwise declaring the action of the respondents 1 to 6 in not initiating any action by conducting enquiry against the 7the respondent and other Ministers as per the allegation leveled by the respondents 8 to 14 particularly 8th respondent as published in the news papers of respondents 15 and 16 and not constituting commission of Enquiries Act, 1952, as arbitrary. unconstitutional violating Article 14 of the constitution of India and also against the public interest and against the interest of the state of A.P. and issue consequential directions directing the respondents 1 to 6 to conduct enquiry into the allegations made against 7th respondent and other Ministers by the respondents 8 to 14 as published in the news papers of respondents 15 and 16 as per law particularly directing the 1st respondent to constitute Commissioner of Enquiries invoking provision of Commission of Enquires Act, 1952 and take appropriate action according to law.

Counsel for the Petitioner: PARTY-IN-PERSON

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: MR.A.RAJASHEKAR REDDY

(ASST. SOLICITOR GEN)

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: MR. T. NIRANJAN REDDY Counsel for the Respondent No.3: MR. S. NIRANJAN REDDY Counsel for the Respondent Nos. 4 & 6: ADVOCATE GENERAL Counsel for the Respondent Nos.5 and 7 to 16: N. A

The Court made the following:

ORAL ORDER: (Per Sri Anil R. Dave, CJ)

The petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the petition so as to make a representation to the first respondent on the subject matter

of the petition.

Permission is granted. The petition stands disposed of as

withdrawn with no order as to costs.

ANIL R. DAVE, CJ

RAMESH RANGANATHAN, J

31.3.2009

bnr