

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

**MONDAY, THE TWELVETH DAY OF SEPTEMBER,  
TWO THOUSAND AND SIXTEEN**

**Present  
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**

**Writ Petition No.10609 of 2011**

Between:


B. Babu Rao, s/o. Moses, aged 32 years, occ:Unemployee,  
R/o.H.No.10-30, Kandulapuram, Near Railway Station, Cumbum,  
Prakasam District and others.

.. Petitioners

AND

Syndicate Bank, rep. by its Deputy General Manager, Regional  
Office, Nellore, Nellore District and another.

.. Respondents



**The Court made the following:**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO**

**WRIT PETITION No.10609 of 2011**

**ORDER**

Petitioners are un-employees. Alleging that the Syndicate Bank, Regional Office of Nellore, initiated process of recruitment to the post of Temporary Attender in various branches under the control of Regional Office at Nellore and such notification was issued without wide publication and that though petitioners were enrolled in the District Employment Exchange at Ongole in Prakasam District, their names were not sponsored since no notification was issued and contending that selections were scheduled to be held on 20.04.2011, this writ petition was filed.

2. By order, dated 19.04.2011, made in W.P.M.P.No.13053 of 2011, this Court directed consideration of the case of petitioners for selection to the post of Temporary Attender, which was scheduled to be held on 20.04.2011 or on any subsequent date.

3. Learned Standing Counsel for the first respondent Bank produced a copy of the letter addressed to him by the Assistant General Manager, Regional Office, Hyderabad (City) of Syndicate Bank, informing the standing counsel that petitioners did not submit their applications for consideration and therefore, they were not considered. He was further informed that the panel was drawn in the year 2011 and candidates included in the panel were appointed to the extent of requirement and the panel is yet to be exhausted and therefore, the question of consideration of petitioners at this stage would not arise.

4. The only relief sought by the petitioners was for consideration of their case in the selections scheduled on 20.04.2011. The main relief sought for in the writ petition was granted at the interlocutory stage. Though order was granted to subject them for selection, in view of the fact that the petitioners did not apply for the selection, the cause in the writ petition does not survive and the writ petition has become infructuous.

5. The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed. The copy of the letter addressed to the Standing Counsel is marked as Annexure 'X' and placed on record. There shall be no order as to costs. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this writ petition shall stand dismissed.

**P. NAVEEN RAO, J**

12<sup>th</sup> September, 2016

sj

