

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

—
WRIT PETITION No.20274 of 2016

ORDER:

The petitioner is working as a Clerk in the first respondent temple. When the Deputy Commissioner of Endowments, Kurnool, accorded permission to the first respondent to engage the services of a qualified person on contract basis, the petitioner was engaged. A letter of appointment was issued on 28.09.2007 appointing the petitioner for a period of eleven months. However, the petitioner is being continued till the date of removal now. The present Writ Petition is filed challenging the proceedings of the Executive Officer of the first respondent temple on the allegation that the petitioner was involved in transportation of Red Sandal and he was arrested along with seven others. It appears that the petitioner absented from duty from the date of arrest without any intimation. On the basis of a news report, enclosing a copy of the report, the present impugned proceedings were issued on 11.04.2016 removing the petitioner from service.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that even a contractual employee or an employee who was not appointed under any rules, is entitled for a notice, as the termination of services would result in adverse civil consequences. He relied on **K.Laxmanna v. Government of Andhra Pradesh**^[1] and, more particularly, the observations made in paragraph 11 thereof. In the said case, the petitioners, who were appointed through a regular selection process pursuant to the Government Orders, were sought to be removed and in those circumstances, this Court held that they are entitled for hearing before removal.

The fact situation in the aforesaid case is different from the present case, wherein the petitioner was appointed on contract basis for a period of eleven months in the year 2007 and is being continued without any further extension. In those circumstances, I do not see any

ground to interfere with the impugned order of termination.

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

(A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J)

23.06.2016
vs

[\[1\]](#) 2010 (6) ALD 679