

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

THURSDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF APRIL  
TWO THOUSAND AND SIXTEEN  
(07.04.2016)

PRESENT  
**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA  
REDDY**  
&  
**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K.JAISWAL**

**WRIT PETITION No.11484 of 2016**

Between:

G.Sathi Babu

**..... PETITIONER**

AND

The Deputy Transport Commissioner,  
Kakinada, East Godavari District and 7 others

**.....RESPONDENTS**

Counsel for the Petitioner

**: Mr.S.JAGADISH**

Counsel for Respondent Nos.1 to 6

**: G.P.for Services (AP)**

The Court made the following:

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA**

**REDDY  
&  
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K.JAISWAL**

**WRIT PETITION No.11484 of 2016**

**JUDGMENT:** (per Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy)

The petitioner who was appointed as Home Guard by the Andhra Pradesh Police Department was one among the 10 home guards allotted to the Transport Department of East Godavari District by the Superintendent of Police, Home Guards, Kakinada. By a letter dated 10.12.2015, respondent No.1 has relieved the petitioner of his duties on 10.12.2015 A.N with instructions to him to report before the Reserve Inspector of Police, Home Guard Unit, Kakinada. Feeling aggrieved by the said letter, the petitioner filed O.A.No.7371 of 2015 on the file of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad (for short "the Tribunal"). By the impugned order, the Tribunal dismissed the said O.A taking the view that the petitioner was relieved by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent without throwing any blame on him and that therefore, no prejudice is caused to the petitioner.

Admittedly, the petitioner belongs to the Police Department and he was temporarily allotted to the Transport Department. Having been allowed to work in the department for more than 7 years, the petitioner was sent back to his parent department. In our opinion, the petitioner has no vested right to insist that he shall be allowed to work in the transport department only, which is not his parent department. The petitioner failed to explain as to what prejudice is caused by his repatriation to his parent department.

Hence, the Tribunal has rightly declined to grant relief to the petitioner, and therefore we do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order.

The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

As a sequel to dismissal of the Writ Petition, WPMP No.14469 of 2016, filed by the petitioner for interim relief, is disposed of as infructuous.

---

**C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY,J**

---

**M.S.K.JAISWAL,J**

Date: 07.04.2016

Dsr