HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVILI

WRIT PETITION NO: 6231 OF 2016

Between:

Ch.Rajashekhar Reddy, (Ch.R.S.Reddy), S/o.Ram Reddy, aged 57years, Occ: ADC, E.No.104284, R/o. 2-86, Budda Nagar, Opp: Uppal Depot, Hyderabad.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. Telangana State Road Transport Corporation, Rep. by its Managing Director, Bus Bhavan, Musheerabad, Hyderabad.
2. The Regional Manager, TSRTC, Secunderabad Region, J.B.S., Secunderabad.
3. The Divisional Manager, TSRTC, Secunderabad Division, Ratifile, Secunderabad.
4. The Depot Manager, TSRTC, Bus Depot Chengicherla, Ranga Reddy District, Hyderabad.
5. The Depot Manager, TSRTC, Cantonment Depot, Cantonment, Secunderabad.

...RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate writ or direction, particularly one in the nature of WRIT OF CERTIORARI, quash the impugned order of removal from service issued in Proc. No.P1/1(04)/2015-CGCL, dated 24.04.2015, and Proc.No.PA/19(E.114)/2015-DVM.SD, dated 08.06.2015 of the 3rd respondent in so far as not granting all the consequential benefits and imposing the punishment and the action of the 2nd respondent in not disposing the petitioner revision petition dated 22.07.2015 submitted on 03.08.2015 and not promoting the petitioner to the post of DC/TI-III on par with his juniors colleagues as illegal, unjust, and in violation of Art. 14, 16 & 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently the petitioner pray this HOn'ble Court may be pleased to direct the respondents to extend the all the consequential benefits, which he would have earned had the petitioner not removed from service in the interest of justice and fair play.

WPMP. NO: 7930 OF 2016

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the 2nd respondent to dispose the petitioner revision petition dated 22.07.2015 submitted on 03.08.2015 pending disposal of the above writ petition in the interest of justice and fair play.

PMP. NO: 7931 OF 2016

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the respondents to promote the petitioner to the post of DC-TI-III on par with his juniors colleagues who were at Sl.No.17 to 40 in the promotion Proc. NO.E4/255(1)/2015-SR, dated 18.12.2015 pending disposal of the above writ petition in the interest of justice and fair play.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI V .NARASIMHA GOUD
Counsel for the Respondents: SRI VASUDEVA REDDY, SC FOR TSRTC

The Court made the following: ORDER

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ABHINAND KUMAR SHAVILI

WRIT PETITION No.6231 of 2016

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking the following relief:

> "...to issue an appropriate writ or direction, particularly one in the nature of WRIT OF CERTIORARI, quash the impugned order of removal from service issued in Proc.No.P1/1(04)2015-CGCL, dated 24.04.2015, and Proc.No.PA/19(E.114)/2015-DVM.SD, dated 08.06.2015 of the 3rd respondent in so far as not granting all the consequential benefits and imposing the punishment and the action of the 2nd respondent in not disposing the petitioner revision petition dated 22.07.2015 submitted on 03.08.2015 and not promoting the petitioner to the post of DC/TI-III on par with his junior colleagues as illegal, unjust and in violation of Art.14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently the petitioner prays this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to direct the respondents to extend all the consequential benefits, which he would have earned had the petitioner not removed from service in the interest of justice and fair play."

Heard Sri V.Narasimha Goud, counsel for the petitioner, and Sri Vasudeva Reddy, Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents.

It has been contended by the petitioner that he was working as a Driver and while so, the disciplinary authority has initiated disciplinary proceedings against him and he was removed from service *vide* orders dated 24.04.2015. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has preferred an appeal to respondent No.3 – Divisional

Manager, and *vide* order dated 08.06.2015, the appeal preferred by the petitioner was partly allowed and the punishment of removal was modified to deferment of annual increment for a period of two years with cumulative effect and the period from the date of removal to the date of performance of the first duty on reinstatement at Depot was directed to be treated as in continuity in service for all purposes. Challenging the said order, the petitioner has preferred a revision before respondent No.2- Regional Manager on 22.07.2015 and the same was served on respondent No.2 on 03.08.2015. The grievance of the petitioner is that though he preferred revision on 22.07.2015, respondent No.2 has not disposed of the same till date.

Therefore, counsel for the petitioner contended that appropriate orders be passed in the writ petition directing respondent No.2 to pass appropriate orders on the revision preferred by the petitioner on 22.07.2015 within a reasonable period of time.

Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents had contended that since revision preferred by the petitioner is pending before respondent No.2, respondent No.2 would consider the same and pass appropriate orders thereon in accordance with law.

This Court, having considered the rival submissions made by learned counsel for respective parties, is of the considered view that this writ petition can be disposed of directing respondent No.2 to consider the revision preferred by the petitioner on 22.07.2015 and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law within a reasonable

period of time, preferably within eight weeks 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.

SD/- N.CHANDRA SEKHAR RAO
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Managing Director, Telangana State Road Transport Corporation, Bus Bhavan, Musheerabad, Hyderabad.
2. The Regional Manager, TSRTC, Secunderabad Region, J.B.S., Secunderabad.
3. The Divisional Manager, TSRTC, Secunderabad Division, Ratifile, Secunderabad.
4. The Depot Manager, TSRTC, Bus Depot Chengicherla, Ranga Reddy District, Hyderabad.
5. The Depot Manager, TSRTC, Cantonment Depot, Cantonment, Secunderabad.
6. One CC to Sri V. Narasimha Goud, Advocate [OPUC]
7. One CC to Sri Vasudeva Reddy, SC for TSRTC, Advocate [OPUC]
8. Two CD Copies

sm

HIGH COURT

DATED:07/12/2020



ORDER

WP.No.6231 of 2016

DISPOSING OF THE WP

WITHOUT COSTS

(9) VLV
15/12/20