



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH  
AT AMARAVATI  
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3310]

TUESDAY ,THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FOUR

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE K MANMADHA RAO**

**WRIT PETITION NO: 5558/2012**

**Between:**

Pelluri Syamasundara Rao

**...PETITIONER**

**AND**

The Deputy Commissioner Of Endowments and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1.N GURU GOPAL

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1.GP FOR ENDOWMENTS (AP)

2.S NARENDRANATH REDDY

3.GP FOR ENDOWMENTS

**The Court made the following:**

**ORDER:**

The Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India,  
seeking the following relief:

*"....to issue a writ order or direction especially one in the nature of the Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondent No.3 in not taking action against the respondent No 4 and in not appointing the Executive Officer U/s 29 of the Endowments Act for Sri Seetharamaswamy Temple Seetharamapuram, Ongole as illegal, void and further declare that the action of the Respondent No.1 in trying to*

*appoint the Trust Board to Sri Seetharama Swamy Temple, Seetharamapuram Ongole through impugned Notification in Rc.No.A5/1105/12, dated 16.02.2012 without waiting for the outcome of the O.A.No 953 of 2011 on the file of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent amounts to denial of statutory right of the petitioner for being appointed as a Chairman and consequently set aside the Notification in Rc.No.A5/1105/12 dated 16.02.2012 and further direct the respondent No.3 to appoint an Executive Officer to manage the affairs of Sri Seetharama Swamy Temple Seetharamapuram Ongole."*

2. On an earlier occasion, i.e., on 20.08.2024, as the learned counsel for the petitioner passed away, this Court has directed the Registry to issue notice to the petitioner.

3. As per the office endorsement, dated 13.09.2024 notice sent to the petitioner was returned unserved due to insufficient address. In view of the same, this Court is unable to proceed further in this matter and it seems that the petitioner has no interest in prosecuting this Writ Petition.

4. Hence, this Writ Petition is dismissed as non prosecution. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

---

**DR. K. MANMADHA RAO, J.**

*Dated : 17.09.2024*  
*TM*