

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA
PRADESH

* HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND

* HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M. GANGA RAO

+ W.A.NO.1929 of 2017

% Date: 19-12-2017

Between:

1. Dr. G. Padmaja W/o. V. Subramanyeshwar Rao, Occ: Contract Lecturer,
R/o. H.No.16-18/3, Munireddynagar, Tirupathi, Chittoor District, and
others.

.... Appellants

And

1. Tirumala Tirupathi Devasthanam, Tirupathi, Chittoor District, rep.
by its Executive Officer.
2. Principal, SPW Degree and PG College, Tirumala Tirupathi
Devasthanam, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.
3. Principal, Sri Govindraraja Swamy Arts College, Tirumala Tirupathi
Devasthanam, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.
4. Principal, S.V. Arts College, Tirumala Tirupathi Devasthanam,
Tirupathi, Chittoor District.
5. Principal, S.V. Oriental College, Tirumala Tirupathi Devasthanam,
Tirupathi, Chittoor District.
6. State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Principal Secretary to Govt.,
Endowments Department, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Guntur District.
7. State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Principal Secretary to
Government, Higher Education Department, Secretariat,
Velagapudi, Guntur District.
8. State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Principal Secretary to Govt.,
Finance Department, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Guntur District.

... Respondents

! Counsel for the appellant

: Mr. P.V. Krishnaiah

^ Counsel for Respondents

: G.P. for Endowments (AP)

< GI ST:

> HEAD NOTE:

? Cases referred

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M. GANGA RAO

WRIT APPEAL No.1929 of 2017

JUDGMENT: (Per VRS,J)

Aggrieved by the refusal of the learned Single Judge to grant ex parte interim directions, while ordering notice in a writ petition, the writ petitioners have come up with the above writ appeal.

2. Heard Mr. P. V. Krishnaiah, learned counsel for the appellants.

3. While challenging the action of the respondents in not granting the time scale of pay, in a writ petition, the appellants sought interim directions. It appears that in certain other cases such as W.P.Nos.35220, 38036, 38751, 41522, 4833 & 23257 of 2017 ex parte interim directions were issued against several universities in the State. Therefore, the appellants claim parity of treatment at least in the hands of the Court.

4. It appears that in the first set of cases that came up before the learned judges, only notice was ordered. But in the subsequent batch of cases, after taking note of the decision of the Supreme Court, ex parte interim directions were issued. Therefore, the appellants claim that they are also entitled to ex parte interim directions.

5. It may be true that the appellants have a very strong case for the grant of interim directions. But the jurisdiction of this Court, under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent, cannot extend to every notice ordered by the learned Single Judge. Therefore, no prejudice will be caused to the appellants, except perhaps waiting for a period of six weeks, in refusing to interfere with the action of the learned Judge.

6. Therefore, the writ appeal is dismissed. However, the Registry shall ensure that after six weeks notice, the matter is listed, the appellants may have the same benefit as their counterparts had.

7. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending in this writ appeal, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J.

M. GANGA RAO, J.

19th December, 2017
Js.



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M. GANGA RAO

WRIT APPEAL No.1929 of 2017



19th December, 2017

Js.