
(2005) 02 AP CK 0087
In the Andhra Pradesh High Court
Case No : Writ Appeal No. 254 of 2005

Regional Manager, APSRTC

APPELLANT

Vs

Md. Javed Pasha

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-02-2005

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2005) 6 ALD 40 : (2005) 4 ALT 127

Hon'ble Judges : T. Meena Kumari, J;S. Ananda Reddy, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : V.T.M. Prasad, for the Appellant; P. Venkateswara Rao, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

S. Ananda Reddy, J.—This appeal is filed by the Corporation aggrieved by the order of the learned single Judge directing the appellant-Corporation to examine the case of the petitioner for appointment irrespective of the fact that he failed to attend duty during the strike period in pursuance of the paper notification given by it and pass appropriate orders regarding his request for appointment in pursuance of his selection made in the year 1999, within a period of three months from the date of receipt of copy of that order.

2. The contention of the learned counsel for the Corporation is that though a panel has been prepared in the year 1999 the same has expired, and therefore, it is not possible for the Corporation to consider the claim of the petitioner.

3. From the material on record, it is clear that the Corporation has advertised 946 driver posts apart from other posts, in pursuance of which, the petitioner and others appeared for the interview and in fact, the Corporation prepared a panel of candidates for appointment. The candidature of the petitioner was not considered on the ground that he failed to respond to a paper notification given by the Corporation during the strike period. But, it is not known as to how the writ petitioner is expected to see the paper notification; and respond to the

Corporation. It is not the case of the Corporation that individual notices or call letters, if any were sent and in spite of that, the writ petitioner did not respond. When the Corporation has failed to issue any appointment orders after the completion of selection process, the laches, if any are only on the part of the Corporation, but not on the part of the writ petitioner. Therefore there is no illegality in the direction given by the learned single Judge and accordingly we do not find any merit in the appeal warranting any interference with the order of the learned single Judge.

4. In the result, this writ appeal is dismissed.