APHC010709932025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3460]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY,THE THIRTY FIRST DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

WRIT PETITION NO: 36508/2025

Between:

S.R.Swarna Latha, **...PETITIONER**

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. M R TAGORE

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR SERVICES II

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

WRIT PETITION No.36508 of 2025

COMMON ORDER:

The present writ petition is filed questioning the inaction of the respondents in not providing employment to the petitioner in terms of G.O.Ms.No.98 Irrigation (PROJ. WING) Department dated 15.04.1986.

2. The land of the father of the petitioner was acquired for construction of SPVB Reservior Telugu Ganga Project for public purpose and an Award No.34/87 dated 31.07.1987 was passed. As per G.O.Ms.No.98 dated 15.04.1986, employment was to be offered to the members of the displaced families or their dependents. The petitioner, being the dependent of the landowner, applied for employment in terms of the said G.O. However, her case was not considered for employment. Hence, the writ petition has been filed.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner relies on the judgment of this Court in W.P.No.40372 of 2018 and batch, and W.P.No.3445 of 2020, wherein employment was directed to be offered to the dependents of the landowners therein, and seeks similar relief in the present cases. Learned counsel further submits that the land acquisition took place in 1987 and, despite the lapse of more than 35 years, employment has still not been provided.

4. Learned Assistant Government Pleader does not dispute that the petitioner is shortlisted for employment and submits that her case will be considered and necessary action will be initiated for providing employment in terms of G.O.Ms.No.98 dated 15.04.1986, as per the rules in force.

5. Considering the fact that the land of the father of the petitioner was acquired way back in 1987, the delay in providing employment cannot be justified; more so, as the employment was to be treated as part of the promised compensation.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of, directing the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner for employment on par with similarly placed persons, as expeditiously as possible. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

Date: 31.12.2025
eha

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

WRIT PETITION No.36508 of 2025

Dated: 31.12.2025

eha