

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH

WRIT PETITION No.19599 of 2000

-

Between:

Kumada Govardhan

... Petitioner.

AND

Andhra Pradesh Forest Development Corporation,
represented by its

Vice-Chairman and Managing Director, UNI
Buildings, 10-1-1200,

III Floor, A.C. Guards,

Hyderabad and another.

...Respondents.

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED:

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S. RAVI KUMAR

1 Whether Reporters of Local newspapers may Yes/No
be allowed to see the Judgments?

- | | | |
|---|--|--------|
| 2 | Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reporters/Journals | Yes/No |
| 3 | Whether Their Ladyship/Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

-

-

-

-

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S. RAVI KUMAR

-

WRIT PETITION No.19599 of 2000

Date:03.08.2015

Between:

Kumada Govardhan

... Petitioner.

AND

Andhra Pradesh Forest Development Corporation,
represented by its

Vice-Chairman and Managing Director, UNI
Buildings, 10-1-1200,

III Floor, A.C. Guards,

Hyderabad and another.

...Respondents.

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE S. RAVI KUMAR

-

WRIT PETITION No.19599 of 2000

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed to issue a writ directing more in the nature of mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in not preparing the final seniority list for the post of Junior Supervisors under the control of second respondent duly giving effect to G.O.Ms.No.93, Social Welfare Department, dated 22-4-1987, is highly arbitrary illegal and violative of Articles 14 & 16 of the Constitution of India and consequentially to direct the respondents to implement the orders of Government and also as per the law laid down by the Apex Court in *GENERAL MANAGER, SOUTHERN RAILWAY vs. RANGACHARI* reported in (AIR 1962 SC 36).

2. Petitioner herein was working as Supervisor in Paderu Division, Narsipatnam, Visakhapatnam District of A.P. Forest Development Corporation Limited and according to him, the second respondent is wrong in not following the G.O., issued by the Forest Department for implementing reservation in promotions, which is their constitutional obligation. According to petitioner, during 1980, his name was sponsored through Employment Exchange, Visakhapatnam for Grade-II Junior Supervisor in the Forest Department and he was selected through written examination, oral and physical tests. According to petitioner, G.O.Ms.No.93, Social Welfare Department, dated 22-4-1987, equally applicable to the second respondent also and they are bound to implement it from the date of G.O., and their inaction in not implementing the G.O., made him to file the present writ seeking a specific direction in the nature of mandamus. Second respondent filed counter contending

that it is a autonomous body, unless the board which administers the second respondent passes a resolution adopting the G.O., issued by Forest Department, it cannot be made applicable to the employees of Forest Development Corporation and the board in its 80th Meeting held on 03-07-1989 passed a resolution approving the implementation of G.O., from that date onwards, they are implementing the said G.O.

3. Heard Arguments.

4. Now the only contention is that according to petitioner that G.O., has to be implemented from 24-08-1987, but the fact remains that G.O., is being implemented from 03-07-1989. Since the second respondent has given convincing reasons for not implementing the G.O., from 24-08-1987, I am of the view that the objection of petitioner is not tenable. On a consideration of material on record, I feel that no further orders are necessary in this writ petition and the same can be disposed of by observing as second respondent has implemented G.O., from 03-07-1989 grievance of petitioner is taken care.

5. The writ petition is disposed of accordingly. No costs.

6. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this Writ Petition, shall stand disposed of.

JUSTICE S. RAVI KUMAR

Date:03.08.2015

mrh

