APHC010984952018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3333]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE 5th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

WRIT PETITION NO: 47911/2018

Between:

1. K. GOPAL REDDY, S/O. K. BALAKRISHNA REDDY, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, OCC. WATER WORKER IN T.T.D., R/O. TIPPAREDDY KANDRAIGA, SEETHARAMPURAM, VADAMALPETA, CHITTOOR, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. TIRUMALA TIRUPATHI DEVASTHANAM, REPRESENTED BY ITS EXECUTIVE OFFICER, ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, K.T. ROAD, TIRUPATHI, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
2. THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER, ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING, K.T. ROAD, TIRUPATHI, CHITTOOR DISTRICT.
3. Y VENKATESH NAIDU, R/O. D.NO. 18-1-281, FLAT NO. 401, SAI SRINIVASA NILATYAM, BHAVANI NAGAR, TIRUPATI.
4. M/S VELKO INFRATECH PROJECTS PRIVATE LIMITED, REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, D.NO. 59-10-2, WATER AND EFFLUENT TREATMENT, MOUNT POONAMALLE ROAD, MANAPAKKAM, P.B.NO. 979, CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU STATE-600089.
5. M/S LARSEN AND TOURBO LIMITED L AND T CONSTRUCTION, REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, WATER AND

EFFLUENT TREATMENT, MOUNT POONAMALLE ROAD, MANAPAKKAM, P.B.NO. 979, CHENNAI, TAMIL NADU STATE - 600089. RESPONDENT NOS. 3 TO 5 IMPLEADED AS PER COURT ORDER DT. 05.01.2023 VIDE I.A.NO. 1 OF 2022 IN WP NO. 47911 OF 2018.

...RESPONDENT(S):

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 to issue a writ, order or a direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the Respondents in not extending the minimum time scale of pay to the petitioner on par with the other regular employees of the water works department is illegal, arbitrary and violative of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of India and pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2018

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 pay the minimum time scale of pay to the petitioner alongwith the other water works employees, pending disposal of the Writ Petition and to pass

IA NO: 1 OF 2022

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 pleased to permit the Petitioner to implead the Proposed Respondents Nos. 3 to 5 as Respondents in the above Writ Petition No. 47911 of 2018 and as well as in Interlocutory Applications, pending disposal of the above writ petition and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. CH VENKAT RAMAN

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. NVS PRASADA VARMA
2. G V S GANESH

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

This Writ Petition came to be filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking the following prayer:

> "…to issue a writ, order or a direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the action of the Respondents in not extending the minimum time scale of pay to the petitioner on par with the other regular employees of the water works department is illegal, arbitrary and violative of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of India and pass…"

2. Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner is working as water worker in the 1st respondent devasthanam, deputed by the 5th respondent; that the petitioner is being paid provident fund by the 1st respondent devasthanam and he is also being provided bus pass to enable him to travel from Tirupati to Tirumala to discharge his duties. The grievance of the petitioner is that in spite of the same, the 1st respondent devasthanam is not paying minimum time scale to the petitioner on par with other regular employees. Aggrieved by the same, the present writ petition is filed.

3. The respondent Nos.1 and 2 filed a counter affidavit stating that the authorities have invited tenders to cope up with the increase of work load and shortage of manpower for maintaining water supply system at Tirumala; accordingly, the 5th respondent agency was engaged pursuant to the said tender and the respondent devasthanam deposits the wages payable to the

workers, before the 5th respondent who in turn pays the same to the petitioner and other such workers. As the employee of the petitioner is the 5th respondent and not respondent Nos.1 and 2, there is no role of respondent Nos.1 and 2 in payment of salary to the petitioner.

4. The 5th respondent has also filed a counter affidavit duly admitting that the petitioner's services are being utilized. The 5th respondent has been awarded the work of operation and maintenance of dams, pumps, pump stations, pump lines, main filter house, kasuvu mandapam filter plant, fountains and sewage treatment plants at Tirumala, Kalyani pumping scheme, pipelines in footpaths and SV poor home at Tirupati. The petitioner herein is one of the contract labour deployed by the 5th respondent in the aforementioned project and accordingly, he is being paid salary and other statutory benefits by the 5th respondent. Further, it is denied that the 1st respondent is paying salary to the petitioner and that merely because the petitioner is provided with a bus-pass through APSRTC for travelling from Tirupati to Tirumala, the petitioner cannot claim pay on par with regular employees of respondent Nos.1 and 2. Hence requested to dismiss the writ petition.

5. Heard Sri. B. Manjeet, learned counsel representing Sri. Ch. Venkat Raman, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri. N.V.S. Prasad Varma, learned Standing counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2; Sri. K. Sakthi Niranjan

Guptha, learned counsel representing Sri. G.V.S. Ganesh, learned counsel for the 5th respondent.

6. Perused the entire material available on record. Admittedly, the 5th respondent has been awarded the work of maintenance water supply system at Tirumala by respondent Nos.1 and 2. As a part of the said project, the 5th respondent deployed the petitioner herein as contract labour. Thus, it is very clear that respondent Nos.1 and 2 are not the employers of the petitioner, as the petitioner is working for respondent Nos.1 and 2 through the 5th respondent agency who pays salary to the petitioner and other similar workers. Even otherwise, during the course of hearing, learned counsel for the 5th respondent submitted that as on today, the petitioner is being paid minimum wages payable as per the Government notifications issued from time to time.

7. In view of the above, this Court is of the opinion that the writ petition is devoid of merits and the same is liable to be dismissed. However, if the petitioner has any grievance with regard to payment of minimum wages by the 5th respondent, he is at liberty to exercise alternative remedy available to him.

8. In the result, this writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Consequently, Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE V.SUJATHA

Dated:05.10.2026
Gss