

APHC010105012019



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

[3396]

THURSDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

WRIT PETITION NO: 4725/2019

Between:

M S Naik

...PETITIONER

AND

The A P S R T C and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.P GOVINDA RAJULU

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.SANISSETTY VENKATESWARLU SC For APSRTC

2..

The Court made the following ORDER:

This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India with the following prayer for:

“...to issue an order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in not regularizing he services of the petitioner in the existing vacancies since he was appointed in the Backlog Vacancies in ST category as capricious unconstitutional and as such liable to be set aside in the interest of justice with a consequential direction to the respondents to Regularize the services of the petitioner at least on par with his colleagues w e f 1.01.2010 with all consequential benefits forthwith...”

2. Heard Sri P.Govinda Rajulu, learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for A.P.S.R.T.C for the respondents.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner worked as Driver. Thereafter, he was removed from service. The parties entered Lok-adalat and award has been passed on 22.08.2014, wherein the respondent-authorities agreed to reinstate the petitioner as fresh candidate. As such the petitioner was reinstated into service on 02.11.2014. Learned counsel would further submit that services of the petitioner were regularized in the year 2016 whereas, services of his batchmates were regularized in the year 2010. Learned counsel would further submit that as the petitioner earlier worked for more than 240 working days, even prior to the Lok-adalat award on par with others, he is also entitled for regularization from the year 2010.

4. Learned Standing Counsel vehemently opposed the petition and would submit that in the light of the Lok-adalat Award, the petitioner was reinstated into service as a fresh candidate. So he could not claim any relief basing on his earlier service.

5. Considering the submissions made and a fair look at the material placed on record, there is some merit in the contention of the learned Standing Counsel that the petitioner cannot claim anything relating to his earlier service to the date of Lok-adalat Award. As rightly put by the learned Standing Counsel, when the parties agreed before the Lok-adalat, award might have passed by the Lok-adalat on the terms agreed between the

parties. Such being the case, unless award is set aside, the petitioner cannot claim any right over his services earlier to the subject award. In that view, this Court does not feel any merit in the contention of the petitioner. Hence, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. In the result, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

Pending applications, if any, shall stand closed.

Dr. VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA, J

Date: 08.05.2025

UPS

135

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

W.P.No.4725 of 2019

Dated.08.05.2025

UPS