

HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 3018 of 2017

Date : 13.2.2017

Between :

B.S. Narayana
APSRTC Driver,
Venkatagiri depot, Nellore district and another

Petitioner

And

APSRTC
Rep by its Managing Director,
PJ Nehru Bus Station,
Vijayawada, AP and others

Respondents

The Court made the following:



HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No. 3018 of 2017

ORAL ORDER:

Petitioners were initially appointed on temporary basis on 30.4.1992. Pursuant to the directions issued by this Court in W P No. 1897 of 1997 filed by them, their dates of regularization were advanced to the dates of their initial appointments. However, petitioners allege that they were not granted any service benefits and seniority list is going to be drawn, wherein, their juniors are likely to be promoted ignoring the petitioners.

2. Learned counsel for petitioners refers to pay slip of November, 2016 wherein the date of joining the service was shown as 1.9.1995 to contend that illegally 1.9.1995 is shown as date of regularization contrary to the earlier orders.

3. When specifically asked, learned counsel for petitioner fairly submitted that petitioners have not applied for copy of service record. It is not clear whether there is any alteration in the service record regarding his date of regularization changing it to 1.9.1995 contrary to the orders passed by respondent corporation dated 14.6.2006, 5.10.2006 and 20.10.2006. It appears there was no further communication given to the petitioners changing the dates of regularization nor there is any correspondence which would reflect altered date of regularization showing the petitioners below persons appointed after 30.4.1992. Thus, it is premature for the petitioners to contend, by merely referring to the entry in the pay slip. Further more, if petitioners have any grievance regarding wrong entry as to regularization, they have to first ventilate their grievance before the competent authority and only if competent authority does not act on their representations or negative reply is given to petitioners contrary to their claim, they can work out their remedies as available in law. It is

open to petitioners to represent to the competent authority to ventilate their grievance, if any.

Subject to above, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Having regard to the same, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, are closed.

DATE: 13.2.2017
TVK

P NAVEEN RAO,J



HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO



WRIT PETITION No. 3018 of 2017

Date : 13.2.2017

