

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

**THURSDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF AUGUST
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE**

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NAMAVARAPU RAJESHWAR RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 26066 OF 2006

Between:

E. Sadanandam, S/o. Komaraiah, aged 43 years, Occ : Shramik, E.No. 342879, R/o. Hanamkonda, Warangal District.

.....PETITIONER

AND

1. Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport -Corporation, Rep. by its Managing Director, Musheerabad, Hyderabad-20.
2. The Depot Manager, Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport -Corporation, Warangal.

.....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 call for the records from the 2nd Respondent and issue an appropriate writ order or direction particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus, declaring that the action of 2nd Respondent in not regularizing services of petitioner on par with his juniors from the date of his initial appointment i.e, 13-1-1992 but regularizing from 1-8-1996 as illegal, unjust, contrary to law, arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and grant all consequential benefits.

I.A.NO:1 OF 2006 (WPMP.NO:33484 OF 2006)

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 regularize services petitioner on par with his juniors

whose services were regularized from the date of their initial appointment forthwith pending disposal of the writ petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner : SRI A.K.JAYAPRAKASH RAO

Counsel for the Respondents : SRI N.CHANDRA SEKHAR

The Court made the following ORDER

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAMAVARAPU RAJESHWAR RAO

WRIT PETITION No.26066 OF 2006

ORDER:

This Writ Petition is filed seeking the following relief:

"...issue an appropriate writ, order or direction particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus declaring the action of 2nd Respondent in not regularizing services of the petitioner on par with his juniors from the date of his initial appointment i.e., 13.1.1992, but regularizing from 1.8.1996 as illegal, unjust, contrary to law arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India and grant all consequential benefits and pass..."

2. Heard Sri A.K.Jaya Prakash Rao, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.N.Chandra Shekar, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents. Perused the material on record.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the respondent-corporation had regularized the services of the petitioner's juniors in November, 1992. The petitioner has made several representations to the respondent authorities requesting them to regularize his services with effect from the date of his initial appointment i.e., from 13.01.1992 instead of 01.08.1996 on par with his juniors whose services were regularized from the date of their initial appointment.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner had submitted a representation, dated 24.04.2006, which

was acknowledged by respondent No.2 on 15.05.2006. However, the respondent authorities have not considered the same till date.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner died on 10.05.2009 and his legal representatives are eligible to get benefits of the deceased employee. In support of his contention, learned counsel relied upon the judgment of ***Dharam Singh and Others v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another*¹**, wherein at para No.19 at clause (iv) it is held that "*In the case of appellant No.5 and any other appellant who has died during pendency, his/her legal representatives on record shall be paid the arrears under clause (ii) up to the date of death, together with all terminal/retiral dues recalculated consistently with clause (i), within three months of this Judgment*".

6. Learned counsel for the respondents has produced death certificate of the petitioner and did not dispute the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

7. Having considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the respective parties, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this Writ Petition is disposed of directing the legal representatives of the petitioner to make a fresh representation within a period of four (4) weeks and upon such representation being made

¹ Civil Appeal No.8558 of 2018

by the legal representatives of the deceased petitioner, the respondent authorities are directed to consider the same and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, preferably, within a period of eight (8) weeks from the date of such representation, if the petitioner is otherwise eligible for any benefits. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, in this Writ Petition, shall stand closed.

//TRUE COPY//

SD/-K.BHAVANI SWAMY
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

SECTION OFFICER

To

1. The Managing Director, Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport -Corporation, Musheerabad, Hyderabad-20.
2. The Depot Manager, Andhra Pradesh State Road Transport -Corporation, Warangal.
3. One CC to SRI A.K.JAYAPRAKASH RAO, Advocate [OPUC]
4. One CC to SRI N.CHANDRA SEKHAR, Advocate [OPUC]
5. Two CD Copies

SA
BS

HIGH COURT

DATED:21/08/2025

ORDER

WP.No.26066 of 2006



**DISPOSING OF THE W.P
WITHOUT COSTS.**

7
Asm
6/12/25