



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

[3233]

MONDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B KRISHNA MOHAN

WRIT PETITION NO: 27436/2013

Between:

1.E. APPALA RAJU S/O NARASIMHULU,, OCCU:C-972763,
CONTRACT CONDUCTOR SIMHACHALAM DEPOT, APSRTC R/O
12-1-10, PITHANI STREET, MAHARANI PETA VISAKHAPATNAM

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE A P STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION, REP., BY ITS
VICE-CHAIRMAN & MANAGING DIRECTOR MUSHEERABAD,
HYDERABAD

2.THE REGIONAL MANAGER APSRTC VISAKHAPATNAM, -

3.THE DY CHIEF TRAFFIC MANAGER APSRTC VISAKHAPATNAM, -

4.THE DEPOT MANAGER APSRTC, PADERU DEPOT, PADERU
VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ, Order or Direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in re-engaging the petitioner as contract conductor afresh vide proceedings of the 3rd respondent No. PA/19 (17)13 -VSK (R) dated 08-03-2013 and also the proceedings APSRTC No. P2/95 (12)/12-PDR dated 27-11-2012 of the 2nd respondent as illegal and arbitrary and further direct the respondent to treat

the petitioner as continuously in service during the period from the date of termination to the date of re-engagement for the purpose of regularization

IA NO: 1 OF 2013(WPMP 34001 OF 2013)

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the respondents to treat the earlier contract service of the petitioner till the date of his re-engagement as continuous service for the purpose of regularization of the petitioner's service as conductor

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.M V RAMA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.K SRINIVASA PRASAD SC For APSRTC

The Court made the following Order:

No representation for the petitioner, inspite of posting the matter under the caption “for dismissal”.

2. On earlier occasions also i.e., on 30.03.2026 and 29.04.2026, there was no representation for the petitioner.

3. Hence, this Writ Petition is dismissed for default. Interim order if any deemed to have been vacated. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, Interlocutory Applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE B. KRISHNA MOHAN

22.06.2026
PGT