

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF
ANDHRA PRADESH**

WRIT PETITION NO.7486 OF 2005

Between:

K.V. Satesh and others

.. Petitioners

and

A.P. Power Transmission Corporation rep. by its
Chief Managing Director, Vidyuth Soudha,
Hyderabad and others

.. Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCEMENT : 11th AUGUST,
2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-
-
-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

- | | | |
|----|--|--------|
| 1. | Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the judgment? | Yes/No |
| | | |
| 2. | Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals | Yes/No |

3. Whether His Lordship wishes to
see the fair copy of the judgment?

Yes/No

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR

-
WRIT PETITION NO.7486 OF 2005

-
ORDER

The petitioners in this case are aggrieved by the letter dated 26.02.2005 addressed by the Superintending Engineer, Operation Circle, Andhra Pradesh Eastern Power Distribution Company Limited (APEPDCL), Vizianagaram, whereby their request for recruitment under B.P.Ms.No.36 dated 18.05.1997 was rejected. They also sought a consequential direction to the respondents to absorb them as Junior Linemen.

No interim orders were granted by this Court in this writ petition.

Ms. Geethanjali Devi, learned counsel representing Dr. P.B. Vijaya Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioners, stated that the petitioners worked as contract labour in Buchannakoneru Sub-station, Vizianagaram, and Zami Village Sub-station, Vizianagaram, under the control of the APEPDCL. According to her, they are entitled to absorption in terms of B.P.Ms.No.36 dated 18.05.1997.

Sri M. Ravindra, learned standing counsel for APEPDCL, on the other hand, contended that the said B.P.Ms. would have no application to the petitioners. He pointed out that under para 4 of the B.P.Ms.No.36 dated 18.05.1997, the erstwhile Andhra Pradesh State Electricity Board ordered that contract labour, other than those engaged in 33 abolished categories, in generating stations should be considered for selection and appointment against 50% existing vacancies in the stipulated posts. The learned standing counsel stated that as the APEPDCL does not

undertake power generation and is only a distribution company, the petitioners cannot claim the relief of absorption in terms of B.P.Ms.No.36 dated 18.05.1997. As to these contentions put forth by the learned standing counsel, Ms. Geethanjali Devi, learned counsel, has no answer.

In that view of the matter, this Court finds no reason to interfere in this matter. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall also stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

SANJAY KUMAR, J

11th AUGUST, 2015
Svv