

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH  
AT HYDERABAD  
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY NINETH DAY OF FEBRUARY  
TWO THOUSAND AND EIGHT

PRESENT  
**THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN**  
**WRIT PETITION NO : 9526 of 1999**

Between:

Gandepally Venkat Rao, S/o Late Laxminarayana,  
R/o Behind Bhadrammagudi, illisipuram,  
Srikakulam District.

**..... PETITIONER**

AND

- 1 The Divisional Manager, A.P.S.R.T.C.  
Srikakulam Division, Srikakulam District.
- 2 The Managing Director, A.P.S.R.T.C.  
Musheerabad, Hyderabad.

**.....RESPONDENTS**

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to declare the action of the respondents herein as arbitrary, illegal discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India by issuing a Writ of Mandamus or any other suitable writ or direction and further direct the respondents herein to absorb the petitioner herein as Hammerman into the service of the APSRTC or for any other suitable post and pass such other further order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interests of justice.

**Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.B.GAJENDER REDDY**

**Counsel for the Respondents: MR.C.APPAIAH SARMA**

**The Court made the following :**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN**

**WRIT PETITION No.9526 of 1999**

**ORDER:**

-

The petitioner, a displaced employee of a bus whose route was nationalized in 1989, has approached this Court time and again seeking his absorption into the services of the Corporation.

2. It is wholly unnecessary to refer to the details of the earlier litigation inasmuch as the orders eventually passed is the order dated 07.08.1998 whereby the petitioner's case for absorption was rejected solely on the ground that the Corporation had issued circular No.PD/61/1998 dated 16.07.1998, notifying the ban of absorption of the displaced workers into the service of the Corporation.

3. Sri G.Gajendra Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner, would submit that, since the only ground for rejection of the petitioner's case, as stated in the order dated 07.08.1998, is that a ban has been imposed, it would suffice if this Court would direct the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner, if he is eligible to be so absorbed, once the ban is lifted. I see no difficulty in granting such a relief.

4. The writ petition is disposed of with a direction that, as and when the ban is lifted, the respondents shall examine the petitioner's case for absorption, as a displaced person, in the light of his eligibility and other conditions stipulated for such absorption.

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

---

**RAMESH RANGANATHAN,J**

29<sup>th</sup> February, 2008

v v

To

1. 2 CCs to

2. 2 CD copies.