

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.GANGA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.8489 OF 2018

ORDER: (per SK,J)

The petitioner is the applicant in O.A.No.1758 of 2017 on the file of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad. By order dated 03.07.2017, the Tribunal dismissed the said O.A. Aggrieved thereby, she is before this Court.

The grievance of the petitioner before the Tribunal was with regard to rejection of her candidature for appointment to the post of Office Subordinate pursuant to the notification dated 27.03.2015 issued by the Assistant Director, Welfare of Differently Abled & Senior Citizens, East Godavari District, Kakinada, for filling up vacancies reserved for local Scheduled Tribe candidates. The Tribunal found that the petitioner was required to appear in person for verification of her certificates but she failed to do so. Opining that the petitioner could not be permitted to reopen the selection process long after its closure when she herself was to blame, the Tribunal dismissed the O.A.

Sri Sriman, learned counsel for the petitioner, would contend that the petitioner was never put on notice as to the dates on which she was to come for certificate verification and therefore, rejection of her candidature was unjustified.

The Assistant Director, Welfare of Differently Abled & Senior Citizens, East Godavari District, Kakinada, filed a counter-affidavit stating that 4838 applications were received in response to the notification dated 27.03.2015. After preparation of a final merit list, the candidates who found place therein were called for certificate verification on 27.02.2016,

20.04.2016, 29.04.2016 and 04.05.2016. In so far as the petitioner is concerned, a message was sent to her Mobile No.9492962110 on 26.02.2016 calling upon her to attend the certificate verification on 27.02.2016. However, she failed to turn up. Again messages were sent to her mobile phone calling upon her to attend the certificate verification counselling on 20.04.2016, 29.04.2016 and 04.05.2016, but to no avail. The Assistant Director further stated that he asked the Mandal Parishad Development Officer, Rajavommangi, to intimate to the petitioner the date of the counselling for verification of certificates but the Mandal Parishad Development Officer stated that he was unable to pass on the information to the petitioner as her house was locked but he could inform the neighbours and requested them to pass on the message to her.

No reply affidavit was filed by the petitioner rebutting the aforestated counter affidavit averments.

Though Sri Sriman, learned counsel, would state that the petitioner resided in a remote locality which had no network facility, the same cannot be a factor to permit her to reopen the selection process which was concluded long ago. No explanation is forthcoming from the petitioner as to why she did not at least respond after information was given to her neighbours. It may also be noted that the counselling took place not on one occasion but on four separate dates spread over nearly four months.

On the above analysis, this Court finds no ground to interfere with the order passed by the Tribunal.

The writ petition is devoid of merit and is accordingly dismissed.
Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall also stand dismissed. No
order as to costs.

SANJAY KUMAR,J

M.GANGA RAO,J

Date:16.08.2018

GJ

