

The Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy
and

The Hon'ble Smt.Justice Anis

Writ Petition No.7053 of 2016

—
Date: 03.03.2016

Between:

P.Sankaraiah

.. Petitioner

and

Union of India
rep. by its Secretary to Govt.
New Delhi and 6 others

.. Respondents

Counsel for the petitioner : Mr.D.Balakishan Rao

Counsel for respondent No.1: Mr.B.Appa Rao
_____ **for Mr.B.Narayana Reddy**
_____ **Asst. Solicitor General**

Counsel for respondent Nos.2, 4 to 6: GP for Services (AP)

—
Counsel for respondent No.3: GP for Services (TS)

—

The Court made the following:

—

—

—

O r d e r: (Per Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy)

This Writ Petition is filed feeling dissatisfied with Order, dated 27-01-2016, in OA.No.104 of 2016 on the file of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad (for short 'the Tribunal').

I have heard Mr.D.Balakishan Rao, learned Counsel for the petitioner, and perused the record.

The petitioner is working as the Assistant Director of Animal Husbandry (Statistics). Under the final allocation made among the States of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana, the petitioner has been allocated to the State of Telangana. His challenge to this allocation is not on the ground that during the allocation, the respondents have violated the guidelines governing the said allocation. His only grievance is that he is the only qualified person for being promoted as the Deputy Director (Statistics), which is the post available only in the State of Andhra Pradesh and that, apart from him, there is no other qualified person, who can be promoted to that post in that State. It is his further grievance that the post of Deputy Director (Statistics) is not available in the

State of Telangana and that as a consequence of his final allocation to the State of Telangana, he is denied the promotional avenue for the rest of his career.

The Tribunal has dismissed the OA as it did not find any illegality in the final allocation made by the respondents. On a consideration of the facts as noted above, we have no reason to differ with the view taken by the Tribunal. It is trite that final allocation of employees may lead to certain hardships to a few of them and the same may prove to be providential for certain other employees. If certain adverse consequences ensue on account of final allocation to some employees, the Courts or Tribunals are not expected to interfere with such allocation only for that reason so long as the allocation made is not in violation of the guidelines governing such allocation. In this view of the matter, we do not find any merit in this Writ Petition and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

As a sequel to dismissal of the Writ Petition, WPMP.No.8983 of 2016, filed by the petitioner for interim relief, is disposed of as infructuous.

(C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy, J)

Dt: 3rd March, 2016
lur

(Anis, J)