

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY**

**WRIT PETITION No. 6814 OF 2008**

**Dt: 31<sup>st</sup> March 2008**

**Between:**

K. Anjaneyulu

...Petitioner

and

The Managing Director,  
APCPDCL, Hyderabad.

...Respondent

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY**

**WRIT PETITION No. 6814 OF 2008**

**ORDER:**

The respondent undertook appointment of Junior Lineman, on contract basis, by issuing a notification dated 20.10.2006. Preference was given to the contract labour, worked between 8.6.2006 and 20.10.2006. The petitioner submitted his application, and when his candidature was not considered, he filed W.P.No.11382 of 2007. The writ petition was disposed of on 4.6.2007, directing the respondent to furnish reasons, for not selecting the petitioner. In obedience to the orders of this court, the respondent passed order, dated 25.7.2007, stating that the petitioner was not selected, on account of the fact that he was not a contract labour, during the relevant period. It was also observed that there are no clear vacancies, except for the candidates belong to the S.T & B.C(C). The petitioner challenges the said proceedings.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

Standing Counsel for the respondent.

The petitioner does not fit into the parameters prescribed under a Notification, dated 20.10.2006, since he does not answer the description of a 'contract labour', for the relevant period, notwithstanding that he was entitled to be considered against the clear vacancy. However, except for the category of S.T & B.C(C), no clear vacancy existed, and all of them were filled up by the candidates worked under a contract labour. Under these circumstances, it cannot be said that the impugned order suffers from any illegality, or infirmity.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that clear vacancies have arisen, at a later point of time. If that be so, the respondent shall have to consider the case of the petitioner, as and when they take up the selection and appointment for the clear vacancies, in future, along with other eligible candidates.

The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

**2008**

---

**31<sup>st</sup> March**

PAN