

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVILI

WRIT PETITION No.20643 of 2018

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking the following relief :-

“.... to issue an appropriate Writ, more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the respondents in not allowing the petitioners to perform their day to day duties and affairs of the 3rd respondent temple is illegal improper and arbitrary and Consequently direct the 2nd and 3rd respondents to allow the petitioners to perform their day to day duties and also by uploading in website and forwarding the names of the petitioners for the benefits extended by G.O.Rt.No.577-Revenue (Endowments) dated 15.09.2017.....”.

Heard Mr.G.Vidya Sagar, learned Senior counsel representing Sri V.Ramesh Kumar, learned counsel for petitioners, the learned Government Pleader for Endowments for respondents 1 and 2 and Sri K.Jagan Mohan Reddy, learned Standing Counsel for the 3rd respondent.

It has been contended by the petitioners that they were appointed during the year 2010 in the 3rd respondent Temple and ever since then, they have been discharging their duties to the best satisfaction of their superiors. Under G.O.Rt.No.577 dated 15.09.2017, the State Government has taken a policy decision to extend the benefit of grant-in-aid in respect of employees engaged by the 3rd respondent Temple.

The main grievance of the petitioners is that the 3rd respondent is not permitting them to discharge their duties from July 2017 and not extending the benefit of grant-in-aid to them. Challenging the same, the present writ petition is filed.

Learned counsel for petitioners contended that during July 2017, the petitioners have demanded the 3rd respondent to pay wages in terms of G.O.Rt.No.577 dated 15.09.2017, but the 3rd

respondent instead of extending the benefit of grant-in-aid had discontinued the services of petitioners.

Learned counsel for petitioners contended that the petitioners have submitted representations on 23.10.2017, 04.12.2017 and 01.01.2018 requesting the respondents to continue them in service. But so far, the respondents have not passed any orders on the representations submitted by the petitioners nor the services of the petitioners were taken back.

Learned Standing Counsel appearing for the 3rd respondent has contended that during July, 2017, the petitioners have voluntarily abandoned the services and in their place some others were appointed. The petitioners cannot turn around and contend that they were prevented from discharging their duties. Therefore, there are no merits in the writ petition and the same is liable to be dismissed.

This Court, having considered the rival submissions, is of the considered view that the writ petition can be disposed of directing the respondents to consider the representations submitted by the petitioners on 23.10.2017, 04.12.2017 and 01.01.2018 and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

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

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVIL, J

Date: 08-03-2019
Prv

