

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO**

-  
**WRIT PETITION No.19190 of 2016**

**ORDER:**

The petitioner is a graduate with Diploma in Commercial and Computer Practices and English Shorthand Higher grade. She is at present a Stenographer in the Viskhapatnam Judiciary on outsourcing basis. While so, the first respondent issued an advertisement on 31.05.2015 inviting applications for three posts of Superintendent (Secretarial Services) prescribing the maximum age limit as 40 years along with some other posts. When there was no response to the said advertisement, a second advertisement was issued inviting applications for the same three posts of Superintendent prescribing the maximum age limit as 40 years. In pursuance of the second advertisement dated 31.08.2015, the petitioner applied to the post of Superintendent (Secretarial Services) along with requisite fee of Rs.1,000/-. Since the petitioner fulfilled the qualifications and submitted necessary proof, she was issued hall ticket intimating the date of examination as 21.12.2015 and 22.12.2015. But, the respondents, for the reasons best known to them, cancelled the selection process initiated pursuant to the second advertisement dated 31.08.2015. In the meanwhile, another vacancy of Superintendent arose. The respondents issued a third advertisement on 31.04.2016 stipulating the maximum age limit as 30 years to the post of Superintendent (Secretarial Services) contrary to the earlier two advertisements with regard to the prescription of age limit. The last date for submission of the applications through online is stipulated as 01.07.2016. The present Writ Petition is filed challenging the reduction of the maximum age limit in the third advertisement as contrary to the age limit prescribed in the earlier two advertisements.

Admittedly, the petitioner is aged about 35 years. She applied to the post of Superintendent (Secretarial Services) pursuant to the second advertisement, but the respondents chose to cancel the said selection

process. When the respondents issued the third advertisement reducing the maximum age limit from 40 to 30 years, it is a policy decision taken by the respondents with which this Court cannot interfere. When this Court asked the learned Counsel for the petitioner to show the service rules prescribing the age limit for the employees, who want to join the service of the respondent Corporation, learned Counsel for the petitioner is unable to produce any service rule.

In the absence of production of any service rule justifying the relief prayed in the present Writ Petition, in view of the freedom of the employer to prescribe conditions in the notification, this Court is not inclined to admit the present Writ Petition.

The Writ Petition is, accordingly, dismissed at the admission stage. The miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

---

**(A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J)**

16.06.2016  
vs