

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATHI

**MAIN CASE: W.P.No.11508 of 2025
PROCEEDING SHEET**

Sl. No.	DATE	ORDER	Office Note
1.	02.05.2025	<u>CGR, J</u> Learned Government Pleader for Services-II takes notice for respondents and seeks time to file counter-affidavit. 2. Let counter-affidavit be filed within four weeks and reply-affidavit, if any, may be filed within two weeks thereafter. 3. List the matter along with W.P.No.8947 of 2023. <u>I.A.No.1 of 2025</u> Petitioners were initially appointed as Nominal Muster Roll (NMR) employees (as Helper) in 1988 and 1987 with 5th respondent Corporation. It is stated that petitioners and other employees, who have been engaged with the 5th respondent, in view of they being surplus, came to be accommodated in existing vacancies and accordingly, were redeployed and allotted to District Employment Exchange Office, Ananthapuramu, by proceedings, dated 08.01.2014, issued by the District Collector, Ananthapuramu, and since then, have been discharging duties as such. 2. Learned Government Pleader for	

		Services-II appearing for the respondents, on the other hand, would submit that as petitioners have been initially appointed as NMR with 5th respondent Corporation, though in spite of they being later redeployed with the District Employment Exchange, Ananthapuramu, in terms of the aforesaid order, dated 08.01.2014, they have to be superannuated by following the service regulations as applicable to the said Corporation and cannot claim parity with Government employees. He placed reliance on the judgment of the Division Bench in W.A.No.1055 of 2022 and batch, dated 05.05.2023. Learned Government Pleader based on the written instructions has further stated that the redeployment orders issued earlier has been rescinded by G.O.Ms.No.180, Finance (H.R.I. PLG-Policy), dated 25.10.2018. Therefore, petitioners cannot claim that they are entitled to be treated on par with Government employees. 3. This Court finds that though petitioners were originally appointed with 5th respondent Corporation as they have been later redeployed to work with Government, by proceedings, dated 08.01.2014, and since then, they have been working with all benefits as entitled by Government employees and having regard to the scheme of redeployment formulated in terms of various Government Orders and Memo.No.29730/484/	
--	--	--	--

		SMPC/99, dated 20.09.1999. The instructions relied on by learned Government Pleader also indicates that G.O.Ms.No.180, dated 25.10.2018 has been challenged before this Court in W.P.No.36354 of 2017 and that there is an order of <i>Status Quo</i>, basing on which, petitioners' are continuing at the place where they have been redeployed. Whereas, petitioners' repatriation back to the parent organization would ultimately rest on outcome of W.P.No.36354 of 2017 and as on today, petitioners are continuing to work with 3rd respondent. This Court is of the <i>prima facie</i> opinion that once petitioners have been redeployed, they would be entitled for the benefits of Government employees as they continues to work in the Government Department. 4. Matter requires deep examination and as this Court in W.P. No.8947 of 2023, has considered similar circumstances and passed interim orders permitting the petitioners therein to continue with the services till attaining the age of superannuation of 62 years, which later was followed in W.P.No.10141 of 2025. 5. Having regard to the aforesaid circumstances, the respondents are directed to continue the petitioners in service till they attains the age of superannuation of 62 years or further orders of this Court. CGR, J KBN	
--	--	--	--

