

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.HARILAL

TUESDAY, THE 24TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/3RD AGRAHAYANA, 1937

WP(C).NO. 35210 OF 2015 (A)

PETITIONER(S):

- 1 N.SANTHOSH KUMAR, AGED 45 YEARS,
S/O. N. NANOO, PARUVELIL MELEVILA VEEDU,
NEELESWARAM P.O., KOTTARAKKARA,
KOLLAM - 691 506
(WORKING AS MECHANICAL, K.S.R.T.C, KOTTARAKKARA DEPOT)
- 2 SAJITH SASI, AGED 34 YEARS,
S/O. SASIDHARAN, RANJIT NIVAS, KURUMANNA,
MUKHATHALA P.O., KOLLAM-691 577
(WORKING AS MECHANIC, K.S.R.T.C, KOTTARAKKARA DEPOT)

BY ADV. SRI.R.PUSHPANGATHAN PILLAI

RESPONDENT(S):

- 1 STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY, TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695 001
- 2 KERALA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION,
REPRESENTED BY ITS CHAIRMAN & MANAGING DIRECTOR,
TRANSPORT BHAVAN, FORT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.695 023.

R BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER

R BY SRI.M.GOPIKRISHNAN NAMBIAR, SC, KSRTC

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
24-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

WP(C) .NO. 35210 OF 2015 (A)

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

- EXHIBIT P1 : TRUE COPIES OF FIRST PAGE OF S.S.L.C. IN RESPECT
OF THE PETITIONERS.
- EXHIBIT P2 : TRUE COPIES OF THE DUTY PASSES IN RESPECT OF THE
PETITIONERS.
- EXHIBIT P3 : TRUE COPY OF G.O.(MS) NO. 78/2011/TRAN DATED
22.12.2011.
- EXHIBIT P4 : TRUE COPY OF COVER PAGE, PAGES 12 AND 13 CONTAINING
CLAUSE XLIX OF THE BILATERAL AGREEMENT DT.22.5.12
- EXHIBIT P5 : A TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 10.5.2012
- EXHIBIT P6 : A TRUE COPY OF THE JUDGMENT DATED 13.10.2015
IN W.P. (C) NO.31186/2015

RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS: NIL

//TRUE COPY//

P.A. TO JUDGE

DST

K. HARILAL, J.

= = = = =

W.P. (C) No.35210 of 2015

- - - - -

Dated this the 24th day of November, 2015

J U D G M E N T

The petitioners are empaneled employees of the Kerala State Road Transport Corporation(KSRTC) and at present, they are working as Machanics in Kottarakkara depot. According to them, they have more than 10 years of provisional service, as they have joined in service in the year 2000 and 2004 respectively under the Corporation and thereby, they are fully qualified to be regularised in the service in terms of Ext.P3. Aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the respondent in the matter of regularisation, the petitioners have preferred Ext.P5 representation to the 2nd respondent. But, the 2nd respondent has not considered the same so far. Hence, this Writ Petition is filed, seeking a direction to the 2nd respondent to consider Ext.P5, at the earliest.

-: 2 :-

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned standing counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent.

3. According to the petitioners, they are entitled to be regularised under Ext.P3, at the earliest. Having regard to the grievance projected in this Writ Petition, I am of the view that the same deserves to be considered and an order be passed by the 2nd respondent.

4. In the above view, the 2nd respondent is directed to consider and pass orders on Ext.P5, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment.

This Writ Petition is disposed of accordingly.

Sd/-
K. HARILAL,
JUDGE

DST

//True copy//

P.A. To Judge