

3The Hon'ble Sri Justice V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN  
and  
The Hon'ble Sri Justice M. GANGA RAO

+ WRIT PETITION No.529 OF 2018

%Date:04.01.2018

Between:

# Dr. C.K. Ramesh Kumar S/o.C. Kistappa,  
Aged about 58 years, Occ: Working as Director In-charge,  
Insurance Medical Services, (under order of change of place as  
In-Charge), D.No.18-4-5; 2<sup>nd</sup> lane, Kedareswara Peta, Vijayawada,  
Krishna District.

...Petitioner

Vs.

\$ The State of Andhra Pradesh,  
Rep.by its Principal Secretary,  
Labour, Employment, Training & Factories (IMS)  
Department, A.P. Secretariat, A.P. Secretariat,  
Velagapudi, Amaravathi, Guntur District and others.

... Respondents

! Counsel for Petitioner : M/s.P. Harinatha Gupta

^ Counsel for Respondents : G.P. for Services (AP)

< Gist :

> Head Note :

? Cases Referred : Nil

HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

AND

HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE M. GANGA RAO

WRIT PETITION No.529 OF 2018

ORDER: (per V. Ramasubramanian, J)

Aggrieved by the refusal of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal to grant an interim suspension of the withdrawal of the In-Charge arrangements earlier granted to the petitioner, the petitioner has come up with the above writ petition.

2. Heard Mr. P. Harinatha Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. By G.O.Rt.No.652 Labour Employment Training and Factories (IMS&Vig.) Department dated 02.11.2017, the In-charge arrangement given to the petitioner as Director of Insurance Medical Services, Andhra Pradesh, was withdrawn with immediate effect and the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent herein was granted the In-charge arrangement. Challenging the said Government Order, the petitioner filed O.A. No.3087 of 2017 on the file of the Tribunal.

4. Though the Tribunal admitted the O.A., the Tribunal refused to grant interim relief. Therefore, the petitioner has come up with the above writ petition.

5. In-charge arrangement is not actually equivalent to promotion. Therefore, the withdrawal of the In-charge arrangement, cannot really be the subject matter of a challenge, except on very limited grounds.

6. The petitioner has filed three copies of the very same Government Order, namely, G.O.Rt.No.652 Labour, Employment Training and Factories (IMS&Vig.) Department, dated 02.11.2017. Two of those G.Os. not only contain the same G.O. number, same date and

exactly identical contents, and only one G.O. contains a variation. Therefore, these are issues that the Tribunal can take note of at the time of final disposal. Refusal to grant interim relief in such cases, cannot be gone into in this writ petition.

7. Hence, the Writ Petition is dismissed, leaving it open to the Tribunal to look into all the aspects and dispose of the Original Application in accordance with law.

8. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

\_\_\_\_\_  
V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

\_\_\_\_\_  
M. GANGA RAO, J

January 04, 2018  
KTL

