

[3446]

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

**WEDNESDAY ,THE TWENTY SIXTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE SUJOY PAUL
AND
THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE RENUKA YARA**

**I.A. No. 2 OF 2025
IN/AND
WRIT APPEAL NO: 345 OF 2025**

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent preferred against the order dated 16.07.2010 passed in W.P No. 24150 of 2005 on the file of the High Court.

Between:

D.Venu Babu, S/o Thanaiah Aged about 67 years Occ. Retd. Legal Advisor,
R/o H.No. 1-9-49/4/B , Ramnagar.

...APPELLANT

AND

1. The Director(Personnel) & Disciplinary Authority, State Trading Corporation of India Ltd, Jawahar Vyapar Bhavan, Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi.
2. The Chairman and Managing Director and Appellate Authority State Trading Corporation of India Ltd, State Trading Corporation of India Ltd, Jawahar Vyapar Bhavan, Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi.

...RESPONDENTS

IA NO: 2 OF 2025

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 condone the delay of 5064 days in filing the writ appeal in the interest of justice

Counsel for the Appellant: SRI. M. ARUN KUMAR REP SRI D. RAMAKRISHNA

Counsel for the Respondents: SRI T. SURYA KARAN REDDY

The Court made the following: COMMON JUDGMENT

**THE HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE SUJOY PAUL
AND
THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE RENUKA YARA**

**I.A.NO.2 of 2025
IN/AND
WRIT APPEAL No.345 of 2025**

COMMON JUDGMENT *(Per the Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice Sujoy Paul):*

Sri M. Arun Kumar, learned counsel represents Sri D. Ramakrishna, learned counsel for the appellant and Sri T. Surya Karan Reddy, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. I.A.No.2 of 2025 is filed by the appellant for condonation of delay of 5064 days in filing the appeal.

3. This Writ Appeal assails the order of a learned Single Judge passed way back on 16.07.2010 in W.P.No.24150 of 2005.

4. The singular reason for explaining the aforesaid delay is that W.A.No 989 of 2010 against the impugned order is filed by the other side. We do not see any merits in the said contention. The said W.A. is filed by the other side with quite promptitude. The filing of said W.A. does not give any reason or cause of action to the present writ appellant. There is enormous delay of 5064 days, which is not properly explained.

5. Accordingly, I.A. is **disallowed**. Consequently, the W.A. is **rejected**. No costs.

Interlocutory applications, if any pending, shall also stand closed.

//TRUE COPY//

SD/-B.SATYAVATHI
JOINT REGISTRAR

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. One CC to SRI. D. RAMAKRISHNA , Advocate [OPUC]
2. One CC to SRI. T. SURYA KARAN REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
3. Two CD Copies

BM
LS

BA

HIGH COURT

DATED:26/03/2025

COMMON JUDGMENT

IA NO.2 OF 2025

IN /AND

WA.No.345 of 2025

I.A. IS DISALLOWED AND THE W.A. IS REJECTED

PA
15/4/25
(5)