

IN THE HIGH COURT OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD

W.P.No.12868 OF 2014

Between:

T.Seetha Devi

... Petitioner

And

Union of India & others

... Respondents

JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED ON: 26.02.2024

THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers : Yes
may be allowed to see the Judgment?
2. Whether the copies of judgment may be : Yes
marked to Law Reporters/Journals?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to : Yes
see the fair copy of the Judgment?

SUREPALLI NANDA, J

THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA**W.P.No.12868 OF 2014****% 26.02.2024****Between:**

T.Seetha Devi

... **Petitioner****And**

\$ Union of India others

... **Respondents**

< Gist:

> Head Note:

! Counsel for the Petitioner : Mr. D.Linga Rao
**^ Counsel for Respondent : Mr. P.Vishuwardhan
Reddy for R1
Mrs.Anjali Agarwal, for
R2&R3**

? Cases Referred:

- (1) (2001) 8 SCC 8
- (2) (2012) 11 SCC 754
- (3) (2013) Indlaw SC 567
- (4) (1993) SCC Supp.(3) 2

THE HON'BLE MRS JUSTICE SUREPALLI NANDA**W.P. No. 12868 of 2014****ORDER:**

Heard Learned Counsel Mr. D. Linga Rao appearing on behalf of the Petitioner, Mr. P.Vishnuvardhan Reddy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent No.1, and Learned Central Government Counsel Mrs. Anjali Agarwal, and the Learned Assistant Government Pleader on behalf of Respondents No.2 and 3.

2. The Petitioner approached the Court seeking prayer as under :

"To issue an appropriate Writ order or direction more particularly one in the nature of WRIT OF MANDAMUS, declaring the action of the Respondent No.1 rejecting the case of the Petitioner vide Order No.112/4/2008-FF(HC) dated 15.02.2012 as illegal, arbitrary and in violation of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India and set aside the same and consequently direct the Respondents to sanction the SSPS, 1980 from the date of the Scheme, till the date of issuance along with interest @ 24% P.A."

3. PERUSED THE RECORD :

a) The relevant portion of the order impugned dated 15.02.2012 of the 1st Respondent herein para 7 and 8 read as under :

"7. You have not produced any primary evidence and your claim is based merely on the certificate issued by Shri S. Ambadas Rao who claims to be Tamra Patra Holder and Camp Assistant Incharge, and certificates issued by Shri Partha Sarthi and Shri Anant Swamy without prescribed NARC which is pre-requisite for consideration of claim on the basis of secondary evidence like Personal Knowledge Certificate. Moreover, instructions for issue of Personal Knowledge Certificate require that such certifiers should have proven jail suffering of a minimum two years and happen to be from the same administrative unit and you have not submitted documents in support of certifiers having undergone minimum two years jail suffering. In view of this the certificates submitted by you cannot be taken as valid PKC.

8. In view of above you do not fulfil the eligibility criteria and evidentiary requirements as per the Swatantrata Sainik Samman Pension Scheme, 1980. Hence it is not possible to accept your claim for grant of Samman Pension and the same is rejected."

b) The relevant paras 15 to 18 of the judgment dated 10.10.2011 passed in W.P.No.4222/2009 is as follows :

"15. The fact that the petitioner has not produced record based primary evidence is of no legal significance at all. The Swatanthra Sainik Samman Pension Scheme, 1980, has clearly recognized that primary evidence may not be readily available and hence secondary evidence can be made available, in the absence of primary evidence. The statement, that the petitioner has not produced Personal Knowledge Certificate (PKC) from the eligible certifiers, by the Ministry, to say the least is a hopeless misstatement of fact. The Swatanthra Sainik Samman Pension Scheme, 1980, recognizes the Personal Knowledge Certificate (PKC) from any prominent freedom fighter who has proven jail suffering of minimum of two years and who happened to be from the same administrative district. Personal Knowledge Certificate (PKC) can be submitted as a supporting evidence to the claim. As was noticed supra, the Collector, Hyderabad District has submitted a complete data in the revised checklist with all enclosures, to his report dated 14.09.2007 and the same was forwarded by the State Government to the Ministry of Home Affairs on 22.11.2007. Sri N.B. Ananth Swamy and Sri Partha Saradhi are two prominent freedom fighters and they are the Thamarapathra. Awardees of Government of India in

recognition of their incarceration of jail terms. Similarly, Sri S. Ambadass Rao is also a prominent freedom fighter and he was also a Thamarapathra Awardee. He was assistant camp-in-charge of Sholapur Camp conducted by Sri K. Lakshman Rao. It is significant to note that Sholapur District is currently forming part of Maharashtra State and it was forming part of the former State of Hyderabad. As to which District Magistrate has issued a detention order against the petitioner more than 60 or 70 years back is nearly impossible to be traced down now. Therefore, the reasons assigned by the Government of India for rejecting the claim of the petitioner are not germane to the issue. They appear as though invented for purpose of rejecting the claim rather than being the result of careful scrutiny of the claim.

16. As was already noticed supra, the Deputy Secretary to the Government of India, in-charge of the freedom fighters division in the Ministry of Home Affairs has acted as the member Convenor of the Hyderabad Special Screening Committee. Therefore, it is that Convenor who should tender an acceptable explanation as to why the Hyderabad Special Screening Committee has failed to scrutinize the application of the writ petitioner. It is a fundamental principle of law that no one can take advantage of once own wrong or error. If the Ministry of Home Affairs has

failed to secure the scrutiny of the application of the petitioner by the Hyderabad Special Screening Committee, it cannot now turn round and seek to take any advantage there from. No reasons are forthcoming as to why the Convenor of the Hyderabad Special Screening Committee or the Ministry of Human Affairs failed to place the papers relating to the petitioner's claim for scrutiny of the said committee or if the papers are placed before the said committee as to the result of their scrutiny.

17. It was recorded that the petitioner has enclosed Personal Knowledge Certificate (PKC) issued by Sri Partha Saradhi, N.B. Ananth Swamy and Sri S. Ambadass Rao. Dealing with these certificates, it was noted in the impugned order that the petitioner has not submitted the Personal Knowledge Certificate (PKC) from the eligible certifiers. "It baffles me that the Thamarapathra Awardee by the Government of India is not recognized as an eligible certifier by the very same Government. I hope and trust that the Ministry of Home Affairs would not be meaning, in the process to heap insult and humiliation on such Thamarapathra Awardees!.

18. There is no rational decision whatsoever behind the impugned action of the respondents in rejecting to award pension to the petitioner under the Swatanthra Sainik Samman Pension Scheme, 1980. Therefore, I set aside the

impugned order and remit the matter back for consideration afresh all such material produced by him by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Freedom Fighters Pension Division for taking appropriate decision and communicate the same at the earliest at any rate on or before 31.01.2012 to the petitioner."

c) The relevant paras of the Counter affidavit filed by the 1st Respondent paras 4.2, 4.3, 4.4. 4.5 and 4.6 read as under :

"4.2. It is established fact that the claim of the late husband of the petitioner late Sri T. Kodanda Ramayya has not been screened and recommended by the erstwhile Hyderabad Special Screening Committee (HSSC), and therefore his claim is a non-HSSC case and could be considered as per the normal provisions of the Swatantrata Sainik Samman Pension Scheme, 1980.

4.3. The claim of the petitioner is mainly based on the purported affidavits/certificates issued by Sri P. Rama Swamy, Sri S. Ambadas Rao, and Sri M. Ramaiah issued in favour of her late husband, and she has produced no documents at all in the form and manner prescribed under the scheme. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its recent judgment in State of Maharashtra and others v. Namdeo etc. [2013 Indlaw SC 567] has clearly concluded

that the "21 Approach of the High Court accepting the version of the respondents merely on affidavits, ignoring the requirements of the Scheme altogether, is fraught with dangers and would be prove to misuse and abuse".

4.4. As per the Scheme voluntary underground sufferings does not make any person eligible for grant of freedom fighter pension. The petitioner has merely claimed that her late husband had gone underground from 01.01.1939 to 30.06.1939, without any criminal case having been registered against him. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down in Union of India v. K. Indrasena Reddy and Anr. [(2007) 4 SCR 686] that a person who had to remain underground for more than six months on account of his participation in the freedom struggle would be eligible for pension under the scheme subject to fulfilment of either of the conditions laid down therein, namely, (i) he has to be a proclaimed offender; or (ii) he is one on whom an award for arrest was announced; or (iii) he is one for whose detention, an order of arrest was issued but not served. The registration of a criminal case against a person would be pre-requisite for fulfilment of any of the above conditions. However, no criminal case is registered against the late husband of the petitioner. This proves that the

claim of the petitioner is bogus claimant and her claim is not covered under the scheme.

4.5. In the absence of any criminal case against the late husband of the petitioner, being pre-requisite for fulfilment of either of the above condition laid down by the Supreme Court of India, the question of consideration of claim on the basis Non- availability of Record Certificate (NARC) with prescribed Personal Knowledge Certificate (PKC) from eligible certifier does not arise.

4.6. It is well settled law that the recommendations by the State Government are not binding unless these are supported by the documentary evidence as per eligibility criteria and evidentiary requirements under the scheme."

4. The case of the Petitioner as per the averments made in the affidavit filed in support of the present writ petition is as follows :

a. The Petitioner's husband late T. Kodandaramaiah has taken an active part in freedom movement of Aryan Satyagraha, Hyderabad launched by Sarvadeshik Arya Prathinidhi Sabha in New Delhi against the Ex-Nizam of Hyderabad and that he had gone underground for a period

of about 6 months from 01.01.1939 to 30.06.1939 and he had participated in the freedom struggle during the years 1947-48 against the Nizam of Hyderabad and taken active part in the freedom movement of Congress Satyagraha and the Petitioner enclosed the copies of certificates issued by the local leaders of Arya Samaj apart from the certificates issued by the Ex-MLAs and local prominent freedom fighters to prove about Petitioner's husband's active participation in the freedom movement along with the affidavit filed by the Petitioner in support of the present writ petition.

b. It is further the case of the Petitioner that the Petitioner applied for sanction of the privileges under the Swatantrata Sainik Sanman Pension Scheme 1980 through Petitioner's late husband's application/representation dt. 13.03.1986 with relevant documents as required under the scheme to the 2nd Respondent herein with an advanced copy to the Respondent No.1. The Petitioner's late husband after

furnishing the required information as sought for by the Respondent Nos.1 and 2 and the Respondent No.3 vide his letter D6/4511/07, dated 14.09.2007 brought to the notice of the 2nd Respondent that the Petitioner's late husband Sri T. Kodandaramaiah's case has been got enquired and recommended to the Government vide letter of 3rd Respondent dt. 06.01.2003 for sanction of Freedom Fighter Pension under Swatantrata Sainik Sanman Pension Scheme 1980 and further that the Tahsildar, Saidabad, once again enquired the matter and reported in revised check list while recommending the petitioner's case and forwarded the revised check list with all the enclosures to the 2nd Respondent for initiation of appropriate action by the 2nd Respondent vide his report dated 14.09.2007. However, enlisting 6 specific grounds, the claim of Petitioner's late husband was considered for sanction of Swatantrata Sainik Sanman Pension Scheme 1980 and thereafter rejected vide Proceedings dated 12.11.2008. Aggrieved by the same, the Petitioner's late husband had filed W.P.No.4222 of 2009 and vide

Judgement dated 10.10.2011 this Court passed orders in favour of the Petitioner herein by setting aside the proceedings dated 12.11.2008 passed by the 1st respondent and a bare perusal of the said judgment indicates a clear finding recorded in favour of the petitioner's late husband, that there is no rational decision whatsoever behind the impugned action of the Respondents in rejecting to award pension to the Petitioner's late husband under the Swatantrata Sainik Sanman Pension Scheme 1980 and the order impugned there under in W.P.No.4222 of 2009 i.e., the proceedings dt. 12.11.2008 of the 1st Respondent had been set aside and the matter remitted back for consideration afresh for consideration of all the material produced by Petitioner's late husband by the Ministry of Home Affairs Freedom Fighters Pension Division for taking appropriate decision and to communicate the same at the earliest at any rate on or before 31.01.2012 to Petitioner's late husband and in pursuance to the directions of this Court dated 10.10.2011 passed in W.P.No.4222 of 2009, the present

order impugned dated 15.02.2012 vide Order No.112/4/2008-FF(HC) had been passed by the 1st Respondent rejecting the request of the Petitioner for sanction of Swatantrata Sainik Sanman Pension Scheme 1980 on the ground that the Petitioner's husband did not fulfil the eligibility criteria and the evidentiary requirements as per the Swatantrata Sainik Sanman Pension Scheme 1980 and hence it is not possible to accept Petitioner's husband's claim for grant of Sanman Pension and hence rejected. Aggrieved by the same the present writ petition is filed.

5. The learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner mainly puts forth the following submissions :

- a) That Petitioner's late husband had submitted all the required documents as furnished by the Respondent No.3, who had initially forwarded the said application to the Respondent No.2.
- b) A bare perusal of Lr.No.D5/2335/1999, dated 06.01.2003 of the Respondent No.3 discloses that

while forwarding Petitioner's late husband's application the Respondent No.3 had furnished the documents (a) affidavit, (b) PKC issued by Sri Padige Ramaswamy, (c) Jail certificate of Sri P. Ramaswamy, (d) PKC issued by Sri Ambadas Rao, (e) PPO of Sri S. Ambadas Rao, (f) Jail certificate of S.Ambadas Rao, (g) PKC issued by Sri M. Ramaiah, (h) PPO of Sri M.Ramaiah, and (i) Camp incharge certificate.

c) A clear recommendation of Petitioner's late husband was made way back in January 2003 by the 2nd Respondent to the 1st Respondent, but however, the 1st Respondent lethargically kept the said application pending for years together and passed the present order impugned without application of mind in a routine manner.

d) Though detention order was passed against petitioner's husband it could not be served since he went underground and as per the scheme since the said detention order has to be proved by way of

documentary evidence and in the absence of such documentary evidence the same can be proved by way of secondary evidence in the form of personal knowledge certificate from the prominent freedom fighter who has proven jail suffering of a minimum of two years, and accordingly in support of the said claim one Mr. S.Ambadas Rao had issued certificate dated 20.11.2002 certifying that the Petitioner's late husband participated in the Sholapur Camp from September 1947 to 1948. It was also specifically stated that the detention order was issued against him and the same could not be served and further the said Ambadas Rao had also issued certificate stating that Petitioner's late husband has participated in Arya Samaj Movement and was detained both by Razakars and Police Hyderabad, and that he had evaded the arrest in the said movement and went under ground for 6 months. Another freedom fighter by name N.B. Anantha Swamy had also issued certificate certifying that

Petitioner's late husband had participated in Arya Samaj movement in the year 1938-39 and also that he had went underground from one 01.01.1939 to 30.06.1939 and also under Congress Stayagraha Movement of Hyderabad against Ex-Nizam of merging with the Government in Indian Union during 1947-48.

e) The Petitioner's late husband satisfied with the condition of secondary evidence by producing the said personnel knowledge certificate before the 1st Respondent and therefore the pleas of the 1st Respondent in the order impugned dt. 15.02.2012, passed by 1st Respondent, that the Petitioner's late husband had not submitted documents in support of the certifiers having undergone minimum 2 years jail suffering and hence the certificates submitted by Petitioner's late husband cannot be taken as valid PKC is illegal and arbitrary.

f) Based on the aforesaid submissions the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner contended that the writ petition should be allowed as prayed for.

6. The learned Central Government counsel appearing on behalf of the 1st Respondent mainly puts-forth the following submissions :

- i) The claimed underground suffering from 01.01.1939 to 30.06.1939 by the late husband of the petitioner was voluntary without any single case having been registered against him.
- ii) Secondary evidence in the form of personal knowledge certificate should be necessarily supported by a valid and acceptable Non-Availability of Records Certificate (NARC) issued by the State Government.
- iii) The Petitioner has not been found eligible for grant of pension under the scheme itself since the Petitioner failed to produce documentary evidence

as per the scheme and hence the question of grant of pension from the date of application does not arise.

- iv) Basing on the aforesaid submissions the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the 1st Respondent contends that the writ petition needs to be dismissed in limini.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION :

7. A bare perusal of the observations in the order obtained in favour of the Petitioner in WP No.4222/2009, dt. 10.10.2011 filed by the Petitioner's late husband challenging an earlier order of rejection dt. 12.11.2008 passed by the 1st Respondent in particular para 15 to 18 (referred to and extracted above) indicate clear findings in favour of the Petitioner observing there is no rational decision whatsoever behind the impugned action of the Respondents in rejecting to award pension to the Petitioner's late husband under the Swatantrata Sainik Sanman Pension Scheme 1980.

8. This Court on perusal of the record opines that on the very same grounds which were not accepted by the Court while disposing W.P.No.4222/2009 and the 1st Respondent being party to the said writ petition cannot turn around and cite the very same reasons and issue the present impugned order dated 15.02.2012 against the Petitioner herein mechanically in a routine manner ignoring the fact as borne on record that the Petitioner's late husband's application/ representation dt. 13.03.1996 was thoroughly examined by the State Government and the Respondent No.3 after conducting due enquiry recommended and forwarded the matter to the Respondent No.2 vide his letter/report dated 14.09.2007 along with the original proposal that was once enquired earlier in the January 2003, very clearly observing that the report dated 06.01.2023 along with the revised check list with all enclosures had been enclosed with the report dated 14.09.2007 of the 3rd Respondent and forwarded to the 2nd Respondent and the 1st Respondent without

examining the material on record in favour of Petitioner's late husband and without understanding and considering the observations of this Court dt. 10.10.2011 passed in WP No.4222/2009 in its true spirit passed the order impugned dt. 15.02.2012 erroneously and unreasonably.

9. The Apex Court after review of the law laid down in earlier cases such as Gurdial Singh Vs. Union of India & Others reported in (2001) 8 SCC 8 and Kamalabai Sinkar Vs. State of Maharashtra & Others reported in (2012) 11 SCC 754 summed up the legal position in State of Maharashtra and Others Vs. Namdeo etc., reported in (2013) Indlaw SC 567 as under showing clear path as to how claims of Freedom Fighter Pension are to be examined.

a) The claims of the freedom fighters are to be dealt with, with sympathy.

(b) The authorities are not to go by the test of "beyond reasonable doubt" and standard of proof based on this principle has to be discarded.

(c) On the contrary, the principle of probability is to be applied and eschewing the technicalities, the approach should be to uphold the entitlement.

(d) When scheme itself mentions the documents which are required to be produced by the applicant, normally those documents need to be produced to prove the claim.

(e) The High Court exercising writ jurisdiction does not sit in judgment over the decision of the State Government like an appellate authority. The order of the State Government is to be examined applying the parameters of judicial review which are available in examining the validity of such orders.

(f) Even if order is found to be perverse or flawed, the High Court can, at the most, remit back to the State Government to reconsider the case.

However, this Court has also observed that there may be cases where because of long lapse of time or other circumstances beyond the control of the applicant, it is almost impossible or cumbersome to procure and produce all the stipulated documents. In such cases, the claim cannot be summarily rejected for want of documents, even though as per the Pension Scheme, such documents are to

be provided. We are of the opinion that to meet such eventualities, following principle needs to be added:

(g) On the basis of evidence/documents/material submitted by the applicant, the Government should examine whether it is a genuine case and the documents produced establish that the applicant had participated in the freedom movement. It should be done applying the principle of probability. If the material/documents produced are otherwise convincing, the Government in appropriate cases may not insist on strict compliance with all the requirements stated in the Scheme."

10. The Apex Court in the judgment reported in (2001) 8 SCC 8 in Gurdial Singh Vs. Union of India vide its judgment dated 26.09.2001 in its head note at (para 6), (para 7) and Para 8 observed as under:

"The Scheme was introduced with the object of providing grant of pension to living freedom fighters and their families and to the families of martyrs. Millions of masses of the country had participated in the freedom struggle without any expectation of grant of any Scheme at the relevant time. Moreover, in the partition of the country most of the citizens who suffered imprisonment were handicapped to get the relevant record from the jails

where they had suffered imprisonment. The problem of getting the record from a foreign country is very cumbersome and expensive. Therefore, in appreciating the Scheme for the benefit of freedom fighters a rational and not a technical approach is required to be adopted. It is also to be kept, in mind that the claimants under the Scheme are supposed to be such persons who had given the best part of their life for the country. **(Para 6)**

Mukund Lal Bhandari v. Union of India, 1993 Supp (3) SCC 2, referred to

The standard of proof required in such cases is not such standard which is required in a criminal case or in a case adjudicated upon rival contentions or evidence of the parties. The case of the claimants under the Scheme is required to be determined on the basis of the probabilities and not on the touchstone of the test of "beyond reasonable doubt". Once on the basis of the evidence it is probalised that the claimant had suffered imprisonment for the cause of the country and during the freedom struggle, a presumption is required to be drawn in his favour unless the same is rebutted by cogent, reasonable and reliable evidence. **(Para 7)**

8. We have noticed with disgust that the respondent authorities have adopted a hyper technical approach while dealing with the case of a freedom fighter and ignored the

basic principles/objectives of the Scheme intended to give the benefit to the sufferers in the freedom movement. The contradictions and discrepancies, as noticed hereinabove, cannot be held to be material which could be made the basis of depriving the appellant of his right to get the pension. The case of the appellant has been disposed of by ignoring the mandate of law and the Scheme. The impugned order also appears to have been passed with a biased and closed mind, completely ignoring the verdict of this Court in *Mukund Lal Bhandari* case. We further feel that after granting the pension to the appellant, the respondents were not justified in rejecting his claim on the basis of material which already existed, justifying the grant of pension in his favour. The appellant has, unnecessarily, been dragged to litigation for no fault of his. The High Court has completely ignored its earlier judgments in *Mohan Singh v. Union of India* decided on 1-6-1995 and CWP No. 14442 of 1995 decided on 11-12-1995."

11. The Supreme Court in Mukundal Bandari Vs. Union of India reported in (1993) SCC Supp. (3) 2 issued the following directions :

"[a] The respondents should accept the applications of the petitioners irrespective of the date on which they are made. The applications received hereafter should also be

entertained without raising the plea that they are beyond the prescribed date.

[b] The respondents should scrutinise every application and the evidence produced in support of the claim and dispose it of as expeditiously as possible and in any case within three months of the receipt of the application, and the documents proof keeping in view the laudable and sacrosanct object of the Scheme.

[c] The pension should be paid to the applicant from the date on which the original application is received whether the application is filed with or without the requisite evidence. The sanction of the pension would, however, be subject to the requisite proof in support of the claim."

12. A bare perusal of Clause b referred to above clearly indicates that the 1st Respondent is bound to function diligently and consider the evidence produced in the support of the claim and dispose it off as expeditiously as possible within 3 months on receipt of the application, but admittedly in the present case though the recommendation as borne on record in favour of the Petitioner's late husband was way back on 06.01.2003 as

per the report of the Collector and District Magistrate, Hyderabad District, dated 14.09.2007 and a reminder as borne on record to the 1st Respondent by the State Government is dt. 23.03.2004 yet there is a serious lapse on the part of the 1st Respondent to abide by the direction of the Apex Court in Mukundal Bhandari Vs. Union of India (referred to and extracted above).

13. Taking into consideration of the above said facts and circumstances of the case and duly considering the observations of the Apex Court in the judgments referred to and extracted above and listed again hereunder:

(1) The Apex Court judgment reported in (2001) 8 SCC 8 in Gurdial Singh v. Union of India and others.

(2) The Apex Court judgment reported in (2012) 11 SCC 754 in Kamalabai Sinkar v. State of Maharashtra & others.

(3) The Judgment reported in (2013) Indlaw SC 567 in State of Maharashtra and others v. Namdeo etc.

(4) The Apex Court judgment reported in (1993) SCC Supp.(3) 2 in Mukundal Bandari v. Union of India.

and duly considering the earlier order of this Court passed in favour of the Petitioner's late husband Sri T.

Kondanda Ramaiah, dated 10.10.2011 in W.P.No.4222 of 2009, and in the light of the discussion as arrived at as above the present Writ Petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the 2nd Respondent dated 15.02.2012 is set aside and the matter is remitted back to the 1st Respondent for consideration afresh of all the material on record pertaining to grant of Sainik Sanman Pension to the Petitioner herein in accordance to law in conformity with the principles of natural justice within a period of 4 weeks from the date of receipt of the copy of the order and duly communicate the decision to the Petitioner. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, in this writ petition shall stand closed.

SUREPALLI NANDA, J

Date: 26.02.2024

Note : L.R. Copy to be marked.
B/o. *Yvkr*