

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

W.P.No.3135 of 2009

ORDER

Challenging the termination order dated 05.11.2007 passed by the 1st respondent, the present writ petition is filed.

The 1st petitioner was appointed as Technical Assistant and the 2nd petitioner was appointed as Computer Operator in the year 2006 under NREGS-AP, and they were working at Valmikipuram Mandal of Chittoor District. While so, during the social audit, on noticing that the petitioners have submitted false muster rolls and fake digitalized photographs of Horticulture plantation for payment under NREGS-AP, they were removed from service on 5.11.2007.

A perusal of the affidavit does not disclose the date on which the petitioners were appointed nor any document relating to their appointment was filed in the present writ petition. However, from the order of removal, it could be seen that they were working as Technical Assistant and Computer Operator respectively.

A counter-affidavit is filed on behalf of the 2nd respondent stating that the MPDO, Valmikipuram, ascertained the irregularities committed by the petitioners, enquired in detail and submitted a report on 27.10.2007 to the 2nd respondent, who in turn, submitted the same

to the 1st respondent. The 1st respondent, after examining the report dated 27.10.2007 of the MPDO and after consideration of the material available on record, observed that the irregularities are grave in nature and accordingly, ordered for removal of the petitioners *vide* proceedings dated 5.11.2007. It is further stated that the petitioners having kept quite for one year, filed the present writ petition.

While admitting the writ petition on 18.2.2009, no interim order was granted by this Court.

When the matter came up for consideration on 21.6.2017, learned counsel for the petitioners was given an opportunity to file copy of the Government orders regularizing the service of the petitioners in order to see whether any rules are applicable regulating their service, but no such copy was filed.

The writ petition was filed in a very casual manner without giving complete details. In the circumstances, this Court has no alternative except to dismiss the writ petition.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand closed.

JUSTICE A.RAMALINGESWARA RAO

5th July, 2017
rkk

