

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN
&
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL THOMAS

FRIDAY, THE 22ND DAY OF MAY 2015/1ST JYAISHTA, 1937

WA.No. 914 of 2015 () IN WP(C).12324/2014

AGAINST THE ORDER/JUDGMENT IN WP(C) 12324/2014 of HIGH COURT
OF KERALA DATED 07-04-2015

APPELLANT(S)/PETITIONER:

JUDE JOSEPH
VEHICLE SUPERVISOR
KERALA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM CENTRAL, THAMPANOOR
THIRUVAMNANTHAPURAM.

BY ADV. SRI.VARUN C.VIJAY

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS:

1. KERALA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION
TRANSPORT BHAVAN, FORT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN &
MANAGING DIRECTOR, PIN - 695 023.
2. THE MANAGER(ACCOUNTS)
(IN CHARGE OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
(ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN & MANAGING DIRECTOR
TRANSPORT BHAVAN, FORT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM 695 023.
3. THE DISTRICT TRANSPORT OFFICER,
KERALA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM CENTRAL, THAMPANOOR
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.

BY SRI.M.GOPIKRISHNAN NAMBIAR, SC, KSRTC

THIS WRIT APPEAL HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 22-05-2015,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN &
SUNIL THOMAS, JJ.

.....
W.A.No.914 of 2015
.....

Dated this the 22nd day of May, 2015.

J U D G M E N T

Thottathil B.Radhakrishnan, J.

1.Writ petitioner is the appellant. He is a supervisor of driving staff in Kerala State Road Transport Corporation. While working in the Thiruvananthapuram Central Depot, the establishment noted that he did not depute drivers appropriately for certain trips and even if there is shortage of drivers, that was not promptly reported to the higher authorities. The establishment placed him under suspension and commenced disciplinary proceedings in relation to one of such situations. As regards another, he was transferred from Thiruvananthapuram Central Depot to Poovar Depot. He challenged both those actions. The learned single Judge set aside the suspension order leaving the disciplinary proceedings to continue. The learned single Judge, however, did not interfere with the order of transfer of the writ petitioner from Thiruvananthapuram Central Depot to Poovar Depot.

2. Having heard the learned counsel for the appellant and having perused the reasoning rendered by the learned single Judge for the conclusions arrived at in the impugned judgment, we see that in discretionary writ jurisdiction the learned single Judge has taken a pragmatic approach inasmuch as no shred of injustice is demonstrated by the transfer of the petitioner within the same district. We are also of the view that administrative priorities in such matters did not warrant interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The learned single Judge was justified in declining to interfere with the order of transfer. This writ appeal, therefore, fails.

In the result, this writ appeal is dismissed in limine.

(THOTTATHIL B.RADHAKRISHNAN, JUDGE)

(SUNIL THOMAS, JUDGE)