## HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD (Special Original Jurisdiction)

## WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY FIFTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FOUR

#### PRESENT

## THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE ALOK ARADHE AND THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE J.SREENIVAS RAO

## WRIT PETITION NO: 20170 OF 2010

#### Between:

The ESI Corporation, rep. by its Regional Director, 5-9-31/1/B, Opp Old Gandhi Medical College, Basheerbagh, Hyderabad.

... PETITIONER

#### AND

- 1. The A.P. State Human Rights Commission, represented by its Secretary, Gruhakalpa, M.J. Road, Hyderabad - 500 001.
- aged 32 years, 3-105/C, 2. Smt.B.Indira, W/o. Late B.Veera Reddy, Adarshnagar Street, Chilkanagar, Uppal Mandal, R.R. District.

...RESPONDENTS

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 pass an order or issue a writ particularly one in the nature of Mandamus, declaring that the summons issued by the first respondent in HRC No.1944/2007 dated 5/6/2010 as illegal being violative of the provisions of the ESI Act, and consequently to set aside the same, and grant such other relief as it deems fit in the circumstances of the case.

## I.A. NO: 1 OF 2010(WPMP. NO: 25596 OF 2010)

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 summons issued by the 1st respondent in HRC No.1944/07 dated 5/6/2010 pending disposal of the writ petition.

## Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI P.SRINIVASULU, REP. FOR SRI B.G.RAVINDER REDDY

## Counsel for the Respondents: NONE APPEARED

The Court made the following: ORDER

# THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE ALOK ARADHE AND

## THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE J.SREENIVAS RAO

### WRIT PETITION No.20170 of 2010

**ORDER**: (Per the Hon'ble the Chief Justice Alok Aradhe)

Mr. P.Srinivasulu, learned counsel representing Mr. B.G.Ravinder Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the cause in the writ petition does not survive for consideration.

3. The aforesaid submission is placed on record.

4. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed as infructuous.

Miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

SD/- P. CH. NAGABHUSHAMBA ASSISTANT REGISTRAR //TRUE COPY// SECTION OFFICER

To,

BSR

LS

K8

One CC to SRI B.G.RAVINDER REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
Two CD Copies

**HIGH COURT** 

DATED: 25/09/2024

ORDER WP.No.20170 of 2010



DISMISSING THE WRIT PETITION AS INFRUCTUOUS, WITHOUT COSTS

