



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

[3457]

**TUESDAY, THE THIRD DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

WRIT PETITION NO: 5466/2012

Between:

1.G.PULLAIAH,KADAPA DISTRICT,S/O.G.VENKATESU R/O.H.NO.1/89,
PANEKALA PADU POST & VILLAGE MUDDUNURU MANDAL,
KADAPA DISTRICT-516380

...PETITIONER

AND

- 1.THE M D APSPDCL 2 OTHERS, REP.BY ITS MANAGING
DIRECTOR,VIDYUTH SOUDHA, PANJAGUTTA,HYDERABAD
- 2.THE CHIEF GENERAL MANAGER SOUTHERN POWER
DISTRIBUTION, COMPANY OF AP LIMITED, CORPORATE OFFICE,
TIRUPATI
- 3.THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER/OPERATION CIRCLE, RAILWAY
STATION ROAD,KADAPA

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.P LAKSHMANA RAO

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

- 1.VENKATA RAMA RAO KOTA SC FOR APSPDCL
- 2.JAGARLAMUDIKOTESWARIDEVI(SC FORAPSPDCL)

The Court made the following:

ORDER:-

Petitioner has filed the present writ petition, challenging the proposed weightage marks be awarded for the inservice contract workers in the notification dated 14.12.2011.

2. Petitioner submits that the petitioner has vast experience and the respondents by proposing to award weightage of a maximum of 45 marks for the inservice candidates, depending on the length of the service in the organization i.e., 5 marks per every half years (i.e., 180 days) service as contract worker. Service less than six months will not be considered for weightage. The notification also mandates that the contract candidates must be continuing in the organization as on the date of the notification.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was working as temporary employee in ICL, Chilamkur. The petitioner submitted the application for recruitment as a Lineman in pursuance of the notification dated 14.12.2011. Aggrieved by the abnormal weightage marks for the inservice candidates, the present writ petition is filed. This Court while admitting the writ petition has passed interim orders by observing that any selection process done during the pendency of the writ petition should be subject to the result of the writ petition. It is submitted that the petitioner is qualified and has applied for the said post, however, the respondents have so far not issued any orders of either appointment or rejection of the petitioner's candidature for employment.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that the grievance of the petitioner has been considered in a batch of writ petitions filed by various candidates, challenging the weightage marks for inservice candidates and the batch writ petitions, W.P.No.3753 and batch of 2012 were disposed off by this Court vide a common order dated 09.12.2013, whereby the weightage marks for experience was directed not to exceed 20% and 2 marks for every completed year of service was to be awarded, apart from other directions issued by the learned single Judge.

5. The Writ Appeal was filed and the W.A.No.110 and batch of 2014 were disposed of on 03.06.2014 and the restriction of marks for weightage for the service candidates to 20% as directed by the learned single Judge was upheld. It was observed that a fresh written test shall be conducted by the respective Discoms for the respective posts for '80' marks, by informing all the applicants at least four (4) weeks in advance before conducting of the examinations. It is submitted that, insofar as the grievance of the petitioner is concerned the petitioner was not entitled for any weightage marks, as admittedly the petitioner was working as a temporary employee in ICL, Chilamkur.

6. Written instructions are placed on record by the learned Sanding Counsel for the respondents. It is submitted that ICL, Chilamkur is an independent and separate organization and does not have any financial or administrative connection with the respondents and the petitioner cannot claim

weightage marks on par with inservice candidates as notified in the notification. The service of the petitioner in ICL, Chilamkur cannot be equated with service of respondents. As such, the petitioner cannot be considered as inservice contract worker for grant of weightage marks.

7. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents.

8. Perused the record.

9. The grievance of the petitioner in granting a maximum of 45% marks to the inservice contract workers is already dealt by this Court and settled in the Writ Appeal order. Insofar, as the claim of the petitioner for the post of Junior Lineman on par with inservice candidates is concerned admittedly, the petitioner's service at ICL, Chilamkur cannot be equated or considered on par with inservice contract workers working in the respondent organization. Clause-IV & V of the notification would amply clarify the legal position and the petitioner cannot claim to be on par with other inservice candidates working with the respondent organization.

10. On these considerations, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE HARINATH.N

Date.03.02.2026
SR