

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.10493 OF 2017

DATED : 24.03.2017

Between :

Smt. Pasam Sujatha
D/o.G. Peda Venkateswar Rao,
Aged: 36 years, Occ: Field Assistant,
R/o.H.No.2054, Neelipudi (V),
Kruthivenu (M), Krishna District & two others.

...

Petitioners

And

The State of Andhra Pradesh
Rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Panchayat Raj, Secretariat,
Velagapudi, Amaravathi,
Guntur District & four others.

...

Respondents



This Court made the following :

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO**WRIT PETITION No.10493 of 2017****ORDER :**

Petitioners were appointed as Field Assistants in the year 2008 on contract basis and the same is renewed from time to time. By proceedings, dated 20.08.2015, the petitioners' contract was not renewed after 30.06.2016. Questioning the very said proceedings, dated 20.08.2015, the petitioners filed W.P.No.25616 of 2016 and this Court after considering the rival claims dismissed the said writ petition. A reading of the order would show that the petitioners were asked to appear before the Three-Men Committee, but they did not appear nor submitted any explanation. Taking note of this, non-renewal of the petitioners' contract was held valid. The operative portion of order in the said writ petition reads as under:

“In spite of giving an opportunity by the three men committee, the petitioners did not attend before the Committee appointed pursuant to the orders of this Court. This Court gave an opportunity for review of the cases where the contracts were not renewed. Since the petitioners did not avail the same, this Court cannot grant any relief to the petitioners. The petitioners also did not file any evidence having appeared before the Committee.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the information obtained by the petitioners subsequently would disclose that the

petitioners appeared before the Committee and made their submissions.

If the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner is correct, the same should have been asserted before this Court at the time of disposal of the earlier writ petition. It is not the case of the petitioners that they were not heard before the writ petition was disposed of.

Since the very same proceedings, dated 20.08.2015, by which, the petitioners were informed of not renewing their contract was already challenged in the earlier writ petition, this Writ Petition is not maintainable.

Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

24th March 2017.

mar

P. NAVEEN RAO, J