HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD
WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE
PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE APARESH KUMAR SINGH
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE G.M. MOHIUDDIN

I.A.No.1 OF 2025
IN
WRIT APPEAL NO: 1058 OF 2025

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent preferred Against Order Dated 12/10/2024 in WP.No.27245 of 2016 on the file of the High Court.

Between:

1. Telangana State Road Transport Corporation, Rep. by its Managing Director, Bus Bhavan, Musheerabad, Hyderabad
2. The Regional Manager, TSRTC, Nalgonda Region, Nalgonda District.
3. The Depot Manager, TGSRTC, Bus Depot, Yadagirigutta, Nalgonda District.

...APPELLANT(S)

AND

1. K.Dasharatha, S/o. Venkataiah, Aged 54 years, Occ. Driver, E.No. 175164, R/o Thangadipalli Village, Choutuppal Mandal, Nalagonda District.

...RESPONDENTS

IA NO: 1 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 569 days in filing the present appeal.

IA NO: 3 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 suspend the order dated 12/01/2024 passed by the Learned Single Judge in W.P.No.27245 of 2016 in the interest of justice.

Counsel for the Appellant : SRI PANAKANTI SATISH KUMAR, (SC FOR TGSRTC)

Counsel for the Respondents: SRI V.NARASIMHA GOUD

The Court made the following: JUDGMENT

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.M.MOHIUDDIN

I.A. No.1 of 2025
in/and
WRIT APPEAL No. 1058 of 2025

JUDGMENT:

Sri Panakanti Satish Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for Telangana State Road Transport Corporation appears for appellants.

Sri V. Narsimha Goud, learned counsel appears for respondent/writ petitioner.

2. The present Writ Appeal is directed against the impugned order dated 12.01.2024 passed in Writ Petition No.27245 of 2016 by the learned writ Court whereby the learned writ Court has modified the punishment imposed upon the respondent i.e., deferment of annual increments for a period of two (2) years with cumulative effect to that of 'without cumulative effect' and rest of the punishment in the order dated 13.02.2012 has been held to be good.

3. However, the instant Writ Appeal suffers from a delay of 569 days for condonation of which I.A.No.1 of 2025 has been

filed. The only explanation in the affidavit of the present Interlocutory Application is at para 9, which is quoted hereunder:

> "9. It is respectfully submitted that the Learned Single Judge of this Hon'ble Court passed the impugned order on 12.01.2024 in W.P. No.27245 of 2016. After receipt of the order the same was enclosed and sent to office of the Standing Counsel for legal opinion. On the Advice of Standing Counsel, Corporation has decided to challenge the impugned order passed by the Learned Single Judge before Divisional Bench and sent the entire case file to the office of Standing Counsel for preferring appeal. Due to above reasons the appeal could not be filed in time. Therefore, there is a delay of 569 days in filing the Writ Appeal, the delay caused is neither willful nor wanton but for the inadvertent reasons explained above, unless this Hon'ble Court condones the delay in filing the present Writ Appeal, the Appellant Corporation would be put to serious and irreparable loss. The grounds of appeal may be read as part and parcel of this affidavit"

This is clearly no explanation or sufficient cause to condone such a huge delay. Appellant No.1 is a Corporation. Administrative delays can't come to its rescue if there is gross and inordinate delay in preferring the appeal.

4. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that there are good grounds in the appeal for the appellants to succeed. Therefore, delay may be condoned.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent has opposed the prayer.

6. Upon consideration of the submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, we do not find any worthwhile explanation to condone such a gross delay of 569 days in preferring the instant Writ Appeal.

Accordingly, the instant Interlocutory Application is dismissed. Consequently, the instant Writ Appeal is also dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous applications, if any pending, shall stand closed.

SD/-A. PRATHIMA
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. One CC to SRI PANAKANTI SATISH KUMAR, (SC FOR TGSRTC). [OPUC]
2. One CC to SRI V NARASIMHA GOUD, Advocate. [OPUC]
3. Two CD Copies.

BSK

HIGH COURT

DATED:24/09/2025

JUDGMENT

I.A.No.1 OF 2025
IN
WA.No.1058 of 2025



DISMISSING THE I.A &
WRIT APPEAL
WITHOUT COSTS

5 copies
Ff
15/10/25