

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

W.P.No.23109 OF 2015

Between:

Jakkula Srinivas

.... Petitioner

A n d

The State of Telangana,
Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Home, Courts C.I Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad
and others

....Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 28.07.2015

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

**HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE DILIP B. BHOSALE
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT**

- | | | |
|----|---|--------|
| 1. | Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments? | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? | Yes/No |
| 3. | Whether their Ladyship/Lordship wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

**HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE DILIP B. BHOSALE
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S.V. BHATT**

W.P.No.23109 OF 2015

PC: *(Per the Hon'ble Sri Justice S.V.Bhatt)*

The petitioner prays for Mandamus declaring the recruitment notifications for the post of Junior Assistant dated 02.05.2015, Field Assistant dated 19.06.2015, Examiners dated 19.06.2015, Typists dated 19.06.2015 and Copyists dated 19.06.2015, wherein the upper age limit is stipulated as 34 years as on 01.07.2015, without extending the benefit of extension of upper age limit in terms of G.O.Ms.No.518, General Administration (Services-A) Department dated 29.06.2013 and not deducting the age of period worked by the petitioner in the department, as illegal and unconstitutional.

Through notification vide Dis.No.908/2009 dated 20.02.2009 of the 3rd respondent, the petitioner has been working as Computer Assistant on contract basis. Admittedly, the age of petitioner as on today is 42 years. The petitioner through the instant writ petition makes two fold grievances against the notifications challenged in the writ petition viz., that the notifications are issued without extending the age limit in terms of G.O.Ms.518 General Administration (Services-A) Department dated 29.06.2013 and not excluding the period of contract service rendered by the petitioner for the purpose of determining the upper age limit is illegal and unconstitutional.

At the time of hearing, the learned counsel fairly stated that as the petitioner is 42 years old, the consideration of the prayers is academic.

Apart from the above, we are of the view that the petitioner cannot, in terms, insist upon implementation of G.O.Ms.No.518 dated 29.06.2013 which has been issued in respect of recruitment through the A.P.Public Service Commission and other recruiting agencies. Nothing is brought to our notice to show that the *ad hoc* rule is applicable to the instant recruitment as well.

No other point is urged by the learned counsel for the petitioner and the writ petition is dismissed.

Consequently, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, also stand disposed of.

ACJ

DILIP B. BHOSALE,

S.V.BHATT,

J

Date: 28.07.2015
Lrkm