

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.30561 of 2016

ORDER:

Heard the learned counsel for petitioner, the learned Government Pleader for Panchayat Raj (AP) for respondents 2 and 3 and the learned Government Pleader for Government Pleader for Revenue (AP) for respondent No.4.

2. The petitioner was appointed as Field Assistant in the year 2007 on contract basis under the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme and his appointment was renewed from time to time. As per the said scheme, the Government will provide minimum 100 days work to the workers per year and the Field Assistants have to mobilize the work as per the job card and supervise the works. When the renewal of petitioner's appointment came up for consideration, his contract was not renewed basing on the performance report generated. Challenging non-renewal of contract, the writ petitioner and similarly situated other Field Assistants filed several writ petitions and this Court, by a common order dated 31.12.2015 in W.P.No.27468 of 2010 and batch, held that by non-renewal of the contract, no stigma is attached, as the tenure of their contracts came to an end by 30.06.2015. However, this Court issued the following directions.

“111. The respondent District Collectors shall form a committee of three officers consisting of Revenue Divisional Officer, any District level Officer, other than the District Panchayat Officer and Mandal Parishad Development Officer of respective mandals. The Committee shall hold its sittings in respective Mandal Parishad Development offices with

advance intimation of date of holding of sitting to Field Assistants hitherto working within the territorial jurisdiction of concerned mandal, whose contract is not renewed, give them opportunity to explain the targets achieved by them which are not accounted/reasons for not achieving the targets, other constraints. The Committee shall also make available the assessment record of respective Field Assistants for perusal of concerned Field Assistants. The Committee shall consider said explanations objectively and make appropriate recommendations to the competent authority.

112. The competent authority shall consider the recommendations of the committee objectively and shall take decision for renewal of the contracts of petitioners having due regard to parameters set out while granting such renewal to others. Until the entire exercise is completed no fresh recruitment shall be made.

113. It is to be noted that if the contract of any of the petitioners is not renewed, they are entitled for consideration for fresh enlistment along with other candidates from open market, more so when the respondents also contend that the decision not to renew the contract of employment is not as a measure of penalty nor intending to attach stigma. Thus, respondents shall permit such of those petitioners whose contract is not renewed also to compete along with open market candidates and consider their suitability for appointment as Field Assistants if they are otherwise eligible and without regard to previous assessment undertaken at the time of renewal of contract.”

3. Pursuant thereto, a notice was issued to the petitioner giving him an opportunity to submit explanation before the Committee. The petitioner submitted his explanation on 03.03.2016. When no orders were passed renewing the contract of the petitioner, the present writ petition is filed.

4. The learned single Judge of this Court in the above batch of writ petitions came to the following conclusion on the basis of the principles decided in the precedents.

“1. Once nature of appointment is contractual, there is no legitimate right to seek to continue in service beyond period of contract.

2. Principles of natural justice cannot be read into matters of contractual obligations.
 3. It is permissible to assess suitability before granting renewal of contract appointment.
 4. Ordinarily matters arising out of contractual obligations including termination of contract having stigma, writ petition is not the remedy and may give rise to civil remedy.
 5. A writ Court is entitled to judicially review the action and determine whether there was any illegality, perversity, unreasonableness, unfairness or irrationality that would vitiate the action.
 6. Power of judicial review cannot be extended to sit in the arm chair of the administrator to decide whether a more reasonable decision or course of action could have been taken in the circumstances.
 7. If it is claimed that termination of contract appointment is illegal, it may give rise to a right to sue for damages.
 8. It is permissible for employer to impose special terms and employee is bound by those terms.”
5. However, he framed the following three points for consideration.
- “(1) Whether the decision not to renew contract is stigmatic and therefore is vitiated?
 - (2) Whether even if decision impugned in the writ petition is held to be stigmatic, can a mandamus be issued to renew the contracts?
 - (3) Whether not affording opportunity to petitioners before holding them as not meeting the targets is arbitrary?”

He held points 1 and 2 against the petitioners and point No.3 in favour of the petitioners.

6. Thus it is clear that what this Court gave is an opportunity to the petitioner to prove his case with regard to the meeting of target, and for the said purpose, a Committee was constituted. Before the Committee, the petitioner submitted his explanation

on 03.03.2016 stating that due to some technical reasons, some of the working days could not be credited to his account and if the same are taken into account, he would be reaching the target. The Committee, without taking into consideration of the above fact, and basing on the web based APD report, passed an order not recommending the case of the petitioner for renewal. A perusal of the recommendations of the Committee indicates that initially the Committee recommended the case of the petitioner for renewal, but it passed an order not recommending his case for renewal. This is evident from the letter of Mandal Parishad Development Officer, Badvel dated 10.03.2016.

7. In the circumstances, non-renewal of the contract of the petitioner is bad and hence the second respondent is directed to consider the case of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders thereon within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

8. The writ petition is, accordingly, allowed. No order as to costs. Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand closed.

A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J

Date: 16.09.2016
TJMR