

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.6575 OF 2017

DATED : 27.02.2017

Between :

M. Srinivas S/o.Gopaiah,
Aged 28 yrs, Occu : Un-employee,
R/o.1-9/1, Kondaipally, Doma Mandal,
Vikarabad District.

..
Petitioner

And

Telangana State Road Transport Corporation,
Rep., by its Managing Director,
Bus Bhavan, Musheerabad, Hyderabad & others.

..
Respondents



This court made the following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO**WRIT PETITION No.6575 OF 2017****ORDER :**

Petitioner claims that he was selected as conductor in the year 2009. He underwent training in respect of theory as well as practical. At that stage petitioner did not join duties and absented. Petitioner made a representation on 07.10.2016 praying to provide him employment. In the said representation for the first time, he states that his brother was seriously ill and he had to take him for treatment at Vikarabad, later to Mahabubnagar and then to Global Hospital, Hyderabad. However, he could not be saved and died on 24.08.2011. He also claimed that he has old age father suffering with paralysis.

2. A bare look at these facts and the representation discloses that nothing prevented the petitioner from joining duty and later seeking leave to attend to his ailing brother, if what is stated by him is true. Further even after the demise of his brother on 24.08.2011, he kept quiet and makes a representation after five years.

3. Merely because a person is selected to the post, he cannot have a right to be appointed or inducted, whenever he wants. A person can claim to have lien only after he joins service and works for sufficient time and is confirmed in that post. Thus, no right accrued to the petitioner to seek appointment after seven years merely because he was selected. More so, it is because of his own volition, petitioner did not join the duty when required.


4. Thus, no direction to the respondents can be issued even to consider his representation, which is made after seven years from the date of selection. As held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **S.S.Rathore Vs State of M.P.**¹, mere submission of representation after long lapse of time, does not save the delay and latches, more so, when no right vested for such appointment. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant the relief of direction to dispose of the representation of the petitioner.

5. With the above observations, the Writ Petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, pending if any, in this writ petition shall stand closed.

27th February, 2017
Rds

P.NAVEEN RAO,J



¹ AIR 1990 SC 10