

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.14953 OF 2010

Dated:27.02.2018

Between:

Vemula Raghupathi, S/o. Uppalaiah,
Age 35 years, Occ: Contract Labour,
R/o.H.No.2-78/1, Village Jeelugula,
Elkathurthy Mandal, Karimnagar
District and others

.. Petitioners

And

The Northern Power Distribution
Company Limited, Andhra Pradesh,
Rep., by its Chairman and Managing
Director, A.P.N.P.D.C.Ltd., Opp: REC
Petrol Pump, Hanamkonda, Warangal
and another

.. Respondents



The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P. NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.14953 OF 2010

ORDER:

Earlier on 20.02.2018, there was no representation. To give one opportunity, the matter was directed to be listed under the caption 'for dismissal'. Today also there is no representation for the petitioners even though the matter is listed under the caption 'for dismissal'.

2. When matter is called, learned Standing Counsel placed before this Court the decision dated 31.10.2017 in W.P.No.3996 of 2010 along with two other Writ Petitions and contended that petitioners also secured less merit than the last meritorious candidate in the respective social categories; therefore petitioners are not eligible for appointment and thus they were not appointed.

3. As seen from the averments made in the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition, petitioners claim to have been working as Contract Labour, possess I.T.I. qualification in Electrical Trade and they were subjected to recruitment process initiated in the year 2006 and even though they secured better merit, they were not considered for appointment on the ground that they did not approach this Court and obtained orders.

4. In paragraph No.8 of the counter affidavit, respondents have given the particulars of marks secured by the petitioners and the cut off mark in the respective social categories. According to the averments in paragraph No.11 thereof, all the petitioners have secured less marks than the last selected candidate in the

respective social groups. This statement of the respondents is not controverted.

5. If that being so, it cannot be said that the petitioners were ignored even though they secured more merit. Therefore, the relief sought by the petitioners cannot be granted and the Writ Petition is liable to be dismissed.

6. The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, filed in this Writ Petition shall stand closed.

Date:27.02.2018

KH

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

