

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.RAMACHANDRA RAO

WP. NO.14884 OF 1999

ORDER:

Heard counsel for petitioner, Sri M.Ravindranath Reddy, Standing Counsel for respondents 1 & 2, and the Government Pleader for Housing appearing for 5th respondent.

2. Petitioner has filed this Writ Petition seeking regularization of his services as Godown Watchman pursuant to G.O.Ms.No.212 Finance and Planning Department dt.22.04.1994 w.e.f. a date prior to 10.07.1995, when the 1st respondent had regularized the services of respondents 3 and 4 as Attenders. He also sought a direction to the 1st respondent to fix his seniority in the post of Attender and pay monetary benefits.

3. In the affidavit filed in support of this Writ Petition, it is stated that the petitioner belongs to Scheduled Caste Community, that he had passed VIII Class in K.H. High School, Ongole, and he was appointed as Watchman to the godown of the 1st respondent by proceedings dt.03.03.1986 w.e.f. 24.12.1985 and had worked as Godown Watchman on NMR basis till the date of filing of the Writ Petition. He contends that his service has not been regularized in terms of G.O.Ms.No.212 dt.22.04.1994, whereas respondents 3 and 4 who were also appointed as Attenders after his appointment got their services regularized under the said G.O.

4. Petitioner also placed reliance on the order dt.28.04.1997 in WP.No.16765 of 1985 wherein one M.Venkata Reddy, who was also working as NMR Watchman from 21.12.1985 in the office of the 2nd respondent, sought relief of regularization as per G.O.Ms.No.212 dt.22.04.1994, which was allowed on 28.04.1997 and direction was given to the 1st respondent to consider the case of M.Venkata Reddy for regularization as Attender or Watchman as per the said G.O.

5. Petitioner contends that subsequent to the said judgment, services of M.Venkata Reddy were regularized as Attender by proceedings dt.28.10.1998 and that petitioner has been discriminated against.

6. No counter affidavit has been filed by the respondent though 18 years have elapsed since the filing of Writ Petition.

7. Sri M.Ravindranath Reddy, Standing Counsel for respondents 1 and 2 states that the respondents 1 and 2 will consider petitioner's case for regularization on par with Sri M.Venkata Reddy, who had also worked as NMR Watchman and whose services were regularized on 28.10.1998, within a period of four (04) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and communicate their decision to the petitioner.

8. In view of the said submissions, this Writ Petition is disposed of directing the respondents 1 and 2 to consider the case of the petitioner for regularization as Watchman as per the

G.O.Ms.No.212 dt.22.04.1994, as was done in the case of Sri M.Venkata Reddy, within a period of four (04) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and communicate their decision to the petitioner. There shall be no order as to costs.

9. Consequently, miscellaneous petitions pending if any shall stand closed.

M.S.RAMACHANDRA RAO, J

16th August, 2017.

gra

