

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH: AMARAVATI**  
**HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE ARUP KUMAR GOSWAMI, CHIEF JUSTICE**  
**&**  
**HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE C. PRAVEEN KUMAR**

**WRIT APPEAL No.184 of 2021**

*(Through video conferencing)*

Andhra Pradesh Mineral Development Corporation  
Ltd., 294/1D, 100 Feet Road, Kanuru to Nidamanuru  
Road, Tadigadapa, Vijayawada – 521 137, Krishna  
District, Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Deputy General  
Manager

... Appellant

Versus

M/s. Murali Manpower Agencies, and another

... Respondents

Counsel for the appellant	:	Mr. V.R.N. Prashanth
Counsel for respondent No.1	:	Mr. Vedula Srinivas
Counsel for respondent No.2	:	G.P. for Industries & Commerce

**JUDGMENT (ORAL)**

**Dt:19.04.2021**

**(ARUP KUMAR GOSWAMI, CJ)**

Heard Mr. V.R.N. Prashanth, learned counsel for the appellant, Mr. Vedula Srinivas, learned counsel for respondent No.1 and learned Govt. Pleader for Industries & Commerce for respondent No.2.

2. This Writ Appeal is presented against the order dated 19.02.2021 passed in W.P.No.23012 of 2020, with regard to the direction of the learned single Judge giving liberty to respondent No.1/writ petitioner to make a representation for consideration of the appellant herein.

3. It is contended by Mr. V.R.N. Prashanth that earlier representation of respondent No.1/writ petitioner was rejected and, therefore, the order passed by the learned single Judge giving liberty to make a representation, is not called for. In this connection, he has drawn our attention to the order dated 25.08.2020 passed by the Vice-Chairman & Managing Director, the Andhra Pradesh Mineral Development Corporation Ltd. The order reads as follows:

*“With reference to the above subject, it is to inform that your claim*

*for field allowance @ Rs.800/- per location per day towards Conveyance facilities, First Aid, Food and Drinking Water facilities for the personnel engaged by your Agency in sand operations is hereby rejected on the ground that there is no provision in the agreement entered nor fixed by the APMDC.”*

4. It is not in dispute that the aforesaid order was not put to challenge earlier. Since the writ petitioner has not challenged the said order, we are of the considered opinion that the writ petitioner cannot be permitted to raise the same grounds once again to initiate a fresh cause of action in the event of rejection of the claim, all over again. However, we are of the considered opinion that apart from the issues that have been determined by the order dated 25.08.2020, if the writ petitioner has got any other grievance, the same may be agitated in the form of a representation.

5. At this juncture, Mr. Vedula Srinivas submits that in the representation, the writ petitioner would raise an issue, amongst others, of non-release of the bank guarantee furnished earlier.

6. Subject to what has been stated above, we find no good ground to interfere with the order of the learned single Judge and the Writ Appeal stands disposed of in the light of the aforesaid observations. No order as to costs. Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

**ARUP KUMAR GOSWAMI, CJ**

**C. PRAVEEN KUMAR, J**

MRR