



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

[3457]

THURSDAY ,THE NINTH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

WRIT PETITION NO: 12700/2012

Between:

P.venkatasiva Reddy, Kadapa District & 10 Others and **...PETITIONER(S)**
Others

AND

The Govt Of Ap Dept Of Energy 4 Others and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner(S):

1.PEETA RAMAN

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.P LAXMA REDDY(SC FOR APTRANSCO)

2.GP FOR ENERGY

3.ANUP KOUSHIK KARAVADI(SC FOR APTRANSCO)

4.Y NAGI REDDY (APTRANSCO)

The Court made the following:-

ORDER:

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The petitioners are challenging the notification dated 18.01.2012, whereby the respondent No.2 corporation issued notification for the recruitment of junior linemen. A direction from this Court is also sought for absorbing the petitioner into regular vacancies.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are working as lineman, helpers/junior linemen and have been serving the respondents by undertaking high-risk work. Though the petitioners have been working for a considerable period of time, the respondent No.2 has issued notification dated 18.01.2012, calling upon applications for the recruitment of junior lineman.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, since the petitioners are already working as linemen and discharging the duties of a lineman, there was no necessity for the respondents to issue a fresh notification. Alternatively, the respondents could have directly recruited or absorbed petitioners into existing vacancies. The learned counsel further submits that the petitioners have been working under the contractor for meager amounts and that they are all qualified and eligible for absorption into service.

5. The learned counsel for the respondents submits that the respondents have cancelled the notifications and the job of junior lineman is outsourced with the contractors supplying the required junior linemen on a contract basis. It is also submitted that there is no proposal by absorb the employees working under the contract.

6. Considering the submissions of both the learned counsel, once the notifications are cancelled by the respondents, further orders on the issue of

the challenge to the notification need not be gone into by this Court. The learned counsel for the petitioners also fairly concedes that the petitioners are only concerned with regard to absorption into service. Insofar considering a direction to the respondents to absorb the petitioners into service is concerned, the petitioners would have to undergo the recruitment process. The policy of the respondents in outsourcing the job of junior lineman or a shift operator is not under challenge before this Court in the present writ petition.

7. With these observations, the writ petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

HARINATH.N,J

09.01.2025
klk

261

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N**WRIT PETITION NO: 12700/2012**

klk
09.01.2025