

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V. NAGARJUNA REDDY
AND
THE HON'BLE SMT. JUSTICE KONGARA VIJAYA LAKSHMI

Writ Appeal No.1481 of 2017

DATED:23-10-2017

Between:

Smt. K. Archana ... Appellant

And

P. Kiranmai
and others ... Respondents

COUNSEL FOR THE APPELLANT: Mr. N. Prem Joy, for
Mr. J. Sudheer

COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.1: Mr. K.G. Krishna
Murthy, Senior Counsel
for Mr. K. Ram Mohan

COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.2: G.P. for Services (AP)
COUNSEL FOR RESPONDENT NO.3: Mr. A.K. Jayaprakash Rao

THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING:

JUDGMENT: *(per the Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V. Nagarjuna Reddy)*

This writ appeal arises out of order dt.30.11.2016 in W.V.M.P. No.1511 of 2015 in W.P. No.2813 of 2015 whereby the learned single Judge made interim order dt.10.02.2015 in W.P.M.P. No.3768 of 2015, absolute.

The appellant and respondent No.1 were appointed as Junior Assistants in a common recruitment, in the establishment of respondent No.3. Purportedly based on the superior merit of respondent No.1, who was shown as senior, she was promoted as Senior Assistant. Later, respondent No.3 by order dt.4.2.2015 reverted respondent No.1 to the post of the Junior Assistant declaring the appellant as Senior. Feeling aggrieved by the said order, respondent No.1 filed W.P. No.2813 of 2015. This Court granted an interim order in favour of respondent No.1 on 10.2.2015. W.V.M.P. No.1511 of 2015 filed by the appellant was dismissed by the learned single Judge. Feeling aggrieved by the said order, the present writ appeal is filed.

At the hearing, Mr. K.G. Krishna Murthy, learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent No.1, placed before us proceedings vide Roc.No.E1A/11080/2016, dt.16.03.2017 of the Executive Officer of respondent No.3 whereunder as many

as 37 Junior Assistants were promoted as Senior Assistants. The name of the appellant is included at Serial No.12 of these proceedings. As the appellant has also since been promoted, we do not find any justification to vacate the interim order granted in favour of respondent No.1. However, the inter se seniority between the appellant and respondent No.1 would depend upon the result of the writ petition.

Subject to the above observations, the writ appeal is dismissed.

As a sequel to dismissal of the writ appeal, W.A.M.P. No.2751 of 2017 shall stand disposed of as infructuous.



C.V. NAGARJUNA REDDY, J

KONGARA VIJAYA LAKSHMI, J

23-10-2017

bnr