

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.4875 OF 2017

Dated:13.02.2017

Between:

Chintada Chalapathi Rao, S/o. Saradhi
Naidu, aged 49 years, Occ: Field Assistant,
Pithatholi Gram Panchayat, Mahatma
Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee
Scheme (MGNREGS), Mandasa Mandal,
Srikakulam District and others

.. Petitioners

And

The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep., by its
Principal Secretary, Department of Panchayat
Raj and Rural Development, Secretariat at
Velgapudi, Amaravathi, Guntur District
and others

.. Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO**WRIT PETITION No.4875 OF 2017****ORDER:**

Heard. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, this Writ Petition is being disposed of at the stage of admission.

2. The claim of the petitioners is that they have been working as Field Assistants since the year 2007 under Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (MGNREGS) in Mandasa Mandal, Srikakulam District. It appears that the contract of the petitioners was not renewed in the year 2015 on the ground that they did not achieve the Labour Budget target of 75% in the respective Gram Panchayats. However, on due satisfaction, the District Collector and District Programme Coordinator, MGNREGS, the 3rd respondent, passed orders on 09.11.2016 directing his subordinates to admit the Field Assistants into duties. The petitioners were also directed to give joining reports to the concerned Programme Officer. The grievance of the petitioners is that the said orders are not complied with causing undue hardship and suffering to the petitioners for no fault of them. Even as seen from the orders, dated 09.11.2016, the Project Director, the 6th respondent, directed the Programme Officer, MGNREGS, to admit the petitioners into duties, but in spite of the same, they were not admitted.

3. These contentions of learned counsel for the petitioners are not disputed by learned Standing Counsel for MGNREGS and, on instructions, he submits that the said orders are in force and are required to be complied with.

4. Having regard to the said submissions, the Writ Petition is disposed of directing the 6th respondent to enforce the orders of the 3rd respondent, dated 09.11.2016, and his directions issued in January, 2017 as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two weeks from today and he should also ensure to take action against the persons responsible for not complying with the directions of the 3rd respondent and his own orders. Further, the 6th respondent shall be personally responsible in enforcement of the orders passed by the 3rd respondent and himself. He shall also appropriately report to the competent authority on the action of the subordinate officers in not complying with the directions of the 3rd respondent and himself. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Writ Petition shall stand closed.

Date:13.02.2017

KH

P. NAVEEN RAO, J