

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.13505 OF 2007

Dated:11.02.2020

Between:

N. Ganga Ram, S/o. Mareeba,
Aged about 43 years, R/o.Bodhan,
Nizamabad District and others

.. Petitioners

And

Public Enterprises (II) Department,
Govt. of Andhra Pradesh, rep., by its
Secretary, Secretariat Buildings,
Hyderabad and another

.. Respondents



This Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.NAVEEN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.13505 OF 2007

ORDER:

Heard learned Government Pleader for Industries and Commerce for respondent No.1 and Sri N. Vasudeva Reddy, learned standing counsel for respondent No.2.

2. This writ petition is filed praying to declare the action of the respondents in not fully extending the benefits under V.R.S., as envisaged in G.O.Ms.No.14, dated 01.05.2002 of respondent No.1 and consequential inaction of respondent No.2 in considering the representation of the petitioners submitted in April, 2003 and December, 2006 and consequential direction to the respondents to take action to extend the V.R.S., benefits as per G.O.Ms.No.14, dated 01.05.2002.

3. When the matter was called on 30.01.2020, learned standing counsel for respondent No.2 informed that the subject matter of the writ petition is covered by the decision rendered by this Court in W.P.No.5448 of 2003, dated 15.11.2018 and circulated photocopy of the order.

4. There was no representation for the petitioners on 30.01.2020. Therefore, to give one opportunity to the petitioners, the writ petition was directed to be listed under the caption 'for dismissal'. Today also when the matter is called, there is no representation of the petitioners.

5. According to learned standing counsel, the petitioners have received the amounts i.e., exgratia under special compensation package in terms of the scheme offered to them without any protest and after accepting V.R.S., benefits, they cannot turn back and seek benefits and the same is not permissible in law. He submits that the petitioners being seasonal workers, they are covered by the orders in G.O.Ms.No.25, dated 21.05.2001 and G.O.Ms.No.14, dated 01.05.2002, did not supersede the entire G.O.Ms.No.25, dated 21.05.2001, and therefore, G.O.Ms.No.16, dated 21.03.2001, is not attracted.

6. The said issue was considered and learned single Judge of this Court accepted the submission of respondent No.2 and dismissed W.P.No.5448 of 2003. Therefore, I am in agreement with the view taken by learned single Judge of this Court and the writ petition is also dismissed.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Pending Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

P. NAVEEN RAO, J

Date:11.02.2020

KH