

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVILI

WRIT PETITION NO.27711 OF 2016

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking a writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the respondents in not paying the terminal benefits to the petitioner for the service rendered by him in the respondent Corporation from 1979 to 1999 as illegal, arbitrary and unjust and sought a consequential direction to direct the respondents to pay the terminal benefits to the petitioner for the period from 1979 to 1999 with interest @ 24% per annum.

Heard Sri G. Ravi Mohan, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Sri N.Vasudeva Reddy, Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents.

It has been contended by the petitioner that initially he was appointed as Conductor with the respondent Corporation during the year 1979 on temporary basis and thereafter his services were regularized. The petitioner further submitted that during the year 1999, he was removed from service for cash and ticket irregularities. Subsequently, he was unsuccessful before the appellate authority and reviewing authority.

The only grievance of the petitioner in this writ petition is that he is entitled for terminal benefits for the service rendered by him in the respondent Corporation during 1979 to 1999 and, therefore, he has submitted a representation to the respondents on 14.09.2015. But, so

far the respondents have not passed any orders on the said representation.

Therefore, the counsel for the petitioner contended that appropriate orders be passed in the writ petition directing the respondents to consider the representation submitted by the petitioner and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law.

Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents submitted that the case of the petitioner would be considered and appropriate orders in accordance with the Rules would be passed on the representation submitted by the petitioner.

This Court, having considered the rival submissions of learned counsel for respective parties, is of the considered view that this writ petition can be disposed of directing respondent No.3 to consider the representation submitted by the petitioner on 14.09.2015 and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, if not already disposed of, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

With the above directions, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVILI, J

23rd October, 2019
v v

