

**HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI**

**W.P. No.18289 /2026**

**PROCEEDING SHEET**

<b>Sl. No.</b>	<b>DATE</b>	<b>ORDER</b>	<b>OFFICE NOTE</b>
1	08.07.2026	<p><b><u>VN, J</u></b></p> <p>The Writ Petition is filed questioning the Proceedings dated 20.04.2026 in rejecting the claim of the Petitioner to continue him in service till the age of 62 years in terms of G.O.Ms.No.15 Fin. (HR-IV FR &amp; LR) Department, dated 31.01.2022 as illegal and arbitrary.</p> <p>The Petitioner was initially appointed as Part-time Vocational Junior Lecturer in the year 1992 in the Respondent No. 4 College. It is stated that though the nomenclature of the post of the Petitioner is stated to be Part-time, the Petitioner is discharging full-time duties. It is stated that the Petitioner and others filed W.P. No. 15963 of 2020 before this Court seeking regularization of their services considering their long-standing service, and the same was pending.</p> <p>It is stated that similarly situated persons, who were also discharging duties as Part-time Vocational Junior Lecturers, also filed W.P. No. 24357 of 2020 before this Court seeking regularization. This Court, taking note of the similar Orders passed in W.P. No. 5009 of 2021 and batch dated 18.10.2024, allowed the said</p>	

		<p>Writ Petitions directing the Respondents therein to regularize the services of the Petitioners therein. Though a Writ Appeal was filed against the said Order, no interim orders were passed. The said individuals are continuing until they attain the age of 62 years.</p> <p>The Petitioner had filed W.P. No. 4975 of 2026 before this Court for extension of his services and this Court by Order dated 23.02.2026 disposed of the same, directing the Respondents therein to consider the case of the Petitioner. Pursuant thereto, the impugned Order was passed rejecting the claim of the Petitioner for extension of age from 60 years to 62 years.</p> <p>Heard Senior Counsel Sri M. Vijay Kumar and the learned Government Pleader for Services-III Sri G.V.L Murthy.</p> <p>The Petitioner is discharging duties as a Part-time Vocational Junior Lecturer since 1992. The very fact that the Petitioner is discharging duties for over 33 years shows that it is perennial in nature and the nomenclature of Part-time is only a camouflage. Though the Writ Petition filed by the Petitioner seeking regularization is pending before this Court, the Writ Petition No. 24357 of 2020 filed by similarly placed persons was allowed, and though a Writ Appeal was filed thereon, no interim orders are passed. In effect, the persons appointed along with the Petitioner</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>are treated as regular employees and continuing the age of 62 years.</p> <p>Secondly, though the nomenclature of the post is "Part-time," the Petitioners were extended the minimum time scale, and the same emboldens the plea that the Petitioners are doing a full-time job.</p> <p>Thirdly, the Petitioner had been working for more than 33 years is <i>prima facie</i> entitled for regularization in the light of the recent judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in <b>Jaggo v Union of India and others</b> (2024 SCC Online SC 3826), <b>Dharam Singh and others vs. State of UP and another</b> (2025 Live Law (SC) 818 and <b>Shripal and others vs Nagar Nigam, Ghaziabad</b> (2025 SCC Online SC 221).</p> <p>Therefore, it would be inappropriate to discriminate the Petitioner by retiring him from service merely on attaining the age of 60 years, the following interim order is passed:</p> <p>i) The impugned Proceedings in RC No.Voc-01/3211914/2026, dated 20.04.2026, proposing to retire the Petitioner from service on attaining the age of 60 years, is suspended.</p> <p>ii) The Respondent Authorities are directed to reengage the Petitioner and continue him till the age of 62 years pending further orders.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Post on 29.07.2026.</p> <p>eha</p> <p><u>VN, J</u></p>	
--	--	---	--