

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE A.RAJASHEKER REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.26578 OF 2017

ORDER:

It is the case of the petitioner that she was appointed on 14.03.2015 as Inclusive Education resource Teacher (IERT) (MR Vacancy), Guduru of Kurnool District, which is an Inclusive Education Resource Centre, for the year 2014-2015 and her services were come into effect from 14.03.2015 and she joined duty on 18.03.2015 at MRC Guduru against the post of IERT (MR) in the office of the Mandal Resource Centre, Guduru Mandal, Kurnool District. The petitioner is eligible to hold the post of Integrated Education Resource Teacher as she completed Post Graduation (M.A) and B.Ed. and PG diploma course in H.I (Hearing Impairment) i.e. InteIntegrated Education Resource Teacher Course to teach hearing impairment students. During her employment as IERT Teacher, the petitioner underwent training for acquiring specialised skills to teach mentally retorted students. In addition to that, the 3rd respondent also conducted skill test and awarded marks for the year 2014-2015 and declared that the petitioner has qualified to continue as Inclusive Education Resource teacher for the years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. Further, the 2nd respondent

appointed three-men committee consisting of MPDO, tahasildar and Nodal Officer to evaluate performance of the others and petitioner to re-engage their services. Basing on their report, petitioner's services were re-engaged along with others and continued upto March, 2017. While so, the 3rd respondent issued proceedings dated 26.04.2017 appointing qualified candidates in the place of IERTS (HI)/VI Category, ignoring the petitioner's services and experience. Questioning the same, some of candidates who were appointed along with the petitioner approached this Court and filed WP.No.17643 of 2017 and this Court passed interim order on 05.06.2017 stating that any appointment made by the respondents in the position of IERT (MR) category shall be subject to further orders. Thereafter, the 2nd respondent directed the 3rd respondent to re-engage the services of the petitioners in the said writ petition, for the year 2017-2018 on conditional basis that they should acquire the requisite qualification within a period of three years to consider their candidature in future. By virtue of the said proceedings, except the petitioner, all other candidates who were appointed along with her, joined into duty and continuing in service. The petitioner also submitted written representation dated 24.07.2017 to the 2nd respondent to re-engage her services as she

is eligible to continue in service on par with other 22 candidates, who were appointed along with her. Aggrieved by the action of the respondent in dis-engaging the services of the petitioner, present writ petition is filed.

Heard both sides.

Since the representation of the petitioner requesting to re-engage her services, is stated to be pending before 2nd respondent, without expressing any opinion on merits, there shall be a direction to the 2nd respondent to dispose of the said representation of the petitioner, in accordance with law, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the writ petition, shall stand closed.

A.RAJASHEKER REDDY, J

10.08.2017
t k.