
(1998) 10 AP CK 0057

In the Andhra Pradesh High Court

Case No : Writ Petition No. 23058 of 1998

R. Mallesu and another

APPELLANT

Vs

Regional Manager, APSRTC, Srikakulam Region and another

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 26-10-1998

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 226

Citation : (1999) 1 ALD 190 : (1999) 1 ALT 191

Hon'ble Judges : B. Sudershan Reddy, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Mr. W.B. Srinivas, for the Appellant; Mr. Y.V. Swamy, SC for APSRTC, for the Respondent

Judgement

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the Corporation. Pursuant to the directions of this Court in WP No.4707 of 1994 the respondent-Corporation had considered the request of the petitioner for absorption into the services of the Corporation. It is stated that the Selection Committee met on 25-5-1994 and examined the cases of the petitioners. The Committee had noticed that the first petitioner had not attended the interview along with the staff who were working on vehicle No. APS 8118 during November, 1987 and January, 1988. The petitioner is stated to have produced letter of appointment counter-signed by the Labour Officer without any date. The Committee had also noticed that the petitioner failed to submit evidence like wage slips, wage registers, vehicle check reports, trip sheets etc., to establish that he had genuinely worked on vehicle bearing No. APS 8118. For the aforesaid reasons, the Committee came to the conclusion that the first petitioner cannot be treated as eligible displaced employee for absorption into the services of the Corporation. The decision of the Committee taken pursuant to the directions of this Court, in my considered opinion, does not suffer from any infirmity whatsoever. The first petitioner cannot keep on agitating and re-agitating the very same issue though the scheme itself had come to an end as early as in the year 1987. The writ petition is absolutely frivolous and the petitioner is merely

indulging in the game of chance.

2. So far as the case of the second petitioner is concerned, the authorities observed that the required number of cleaners were already absorbed consequent on the nationalisation of bus routes in Srikakulam district. Under those circumstances, his case for absorption into the Corporation as displaced cleaner has been rejected. The order does not suffer from any infirmity. This Court cannot go on issuing writs compelling the respondents to go on considering the cases of the petitioners as and when they come to this Court and in accordance with their convenience. It would cause any amount of administrative inconvenience and any directions from this Court would amount to issuing futile writs such a course is not permissible.

3. The writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed. No costs.