

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.2914 of 2009

ORDER:

The undisputed facts in the present case are that the petitioner was appointed as a Sweeper-cum-Scavenger on 10.08.1988 in the fifth respondent college situated at Narsampet Road, Warangal. His services were regularized with effect from 09.10.2001 as per G.O.Ms.No.107, Higher Education (CE.III) Department, dated 09.10.2001, in the same post with a basic pay of Rs.2,810/- per month. The case of the petitioner is that his services ought to have been regularized with effect from 1993 since he completed five years of service from the date of initial appointment. Seeking such relief he came to this Court in the year 2009, and filed the present Writ Petition.

No counter affidavit is filed by the respondents.

Learned Counsel for the petitioner vehemently argued that as per G.O.Ms.No.212, dated 22.04.1994, the petitioner is entitled for regularization of his services as soon as he completed five years of service, and regularization with effect from 09.10.2001 is bad.

The petitioner filed a copy of the Identity Card and did not file any other documents in order to understand the nature of his initial appointment. It is not known whether the said post was recognized by the Government for grant in aid. More over, the petitioner came to this Court after eight years of his

regularization with effect from 09.10.2001 as per G.O.Ms.No.107 of even date. Under the said Government Order, the services of 25 persons working in different colleges all over the State were regularized. Even in the affidavit also the petitioner did not make out a case, except saying that he is entitled for regularization of services from 1993.

Though no counter affidavit is filed, learned Government Pleader brought to the notice of this Court an order of this Court in W.P.No.2918 of 2009, dated 04.11.2016, dismissing the Writ Petition filed by another Watchman-cum-Sweeper.

In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to grant the relief sought for by the petitioner in the Writ Petition. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. However, it is made clear that this will not prevent the petitioner from submitting a representation expressing his grievance, and the respondents considering the same in accordance with law. The miscellaneous petitions pending in this Writ Petition, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

28.06.2017
vs

(A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO, J)