

THE HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
THE HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE T. AMARNATH GOUD

WRIT APPEAL No.393 OF 2017

Date:05.03.2018

Between:

R.B.V.R.R. Womens College,
Narayanaguda, Hyderabad, T.S.,
Rep. by Secretary-cum-Correspondent,
Sri Prof. K. Muthyam Reddy

...Appellant

Vs.

Dr. J. Achyuthadevi W/ o.N. Ranga Reddy,
Age: 50 years, R/ o.Flat No.302, H.No.2-2-24/ BL/ 6 & 6A
B.L. Colony Bagh, Gandhi Nagar, Hyderabad and others.

... Respondents

! Counsel for appellant : Sri Avinash Desai

^ Counsel for Respondents : Sri Vedula Srinivas

< Gist :

> Head Note :

? Cases Referred : Nil



HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

AND

HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE T. AMARNATH GOUD

WRIT APPEAL No.393 OF 2017

JUDGMENT: (per V. Ramasubramanian, J)

Aggrieved by an ad-interim order passed by the learned Single Judge while entertaining a writ petition at the behest of the respondents 1 and 2, directing them to pay the minimum time scale attached to the post of lecturer, the Management of an aided private college has come up with the above writ appeal.

2. Heard Mr. Avinash Desai, learned counsel for the appellant. Mr. Vedula Srinivas, learned counsel takes notice for the respondents 1 and 2.

3. The case of the appellant is that the respondents 1 and 2 were appointed only in unaided sections and that they are paid salary on par with all others appointed in unaided Sections and that persons appointed in unaided sections cannot claim parity of pay with those appointed in the aided sections. It is the contention of the learned counsel that if the respondents 1 and 2 are to be paid the same scale of pay as that of persons working in the aided sections, they must first get their appointment approved by the Government and it is the responsibility of the Government to pay the same. We do not wish to pronounce a verdict on the above contention, though prima facie we do not approve the contentions. The fact remains that the order impugned is only an ad-interim order, which is capable of being modified or confirmed on a proper application taken out by the appellant.

4. Therefore, leaving it open to the appellant to take out appropriate application before the learned single Judge, this writ appeal is dismissed.

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

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

T. AMARNATH GOUD, J

March 05, 2018
KTL

