

Bindumol A.N. Vs. Idukki District Co-operative Bank Ltd.

Bindumol A.N. Vs. Idukki District Co-operative Bank Ltd.

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1015431

Court : Kerala

Decided On : Jan-30-2013

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice K.Surendra Mohan

Appellant : Bindumol A.N.

Respondent : idukki District Co-operative Bank Ltd.

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM PRESENT: THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.SURENDRA MOHAN WEDNESDAY, THE 30TH DAY OF JANUARY 2013 10TH MAGHA 193 WP(C).No. 1665 of 2013 (G) ----- PETITIONER: ----- BINDUMOL A.N., AGED 3 YEARS W/O.SURESH, EDAYAKUNNEL VEEDU, UDUMBANOOR.P.O THODUPUZHA, IDUKKI-685595. BY ADV. SRI.LATHEESH SEBASTIAN RESPONDENT(S): ----- 1. IDUKKI DISTRICT CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD., REPRESENTED BY ITS GENERAL MANAGER, IDUKKI COLONY IDUKKI-685 586.

2. BRANCH MANAGER, IDUKKI DISTRICT CO-OPERATIVE BANK LTD UDUMBANOOR BRANCH, THODUPUZHA, IDUKKI DISTRICT PIN-685 584. BY ADV. SRI.JOICE GEORGE, SC, IDUKKI DIST.CO-OP.BANK LTD THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 30-01-2013, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING: WP(C).No. 1665 of 2013 (G) APPENDIX PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS : EXT-P1 TRUE COPY OF THE

APPLICATION EXT-P2 TRUE COPY OF THE INTERVIEW NOTICE EXT-P3
TRUE COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT.
RESPONDENTS' EXHIBITS : NIL //True copy// P.A. TO JUDGE Shg/
K.SURENDRA MOHAN, J.

----- W.P.(C) No.1665 of 2013
----- Dated this the 30th day of January, 2013

JUDGMENT

The petitioner, who was working as a Part-Time Sweeper of the first respondent Bank, has filed this writ petition challenging her termination. According to the petitioner, she was selected and appointed after conducting a competitive selection process by the first respondent on 22.12.2010. Therefore, it is contended that she has a right to continue in service.

2. A statement has been filed on behalf of the respondents pointing out that the petitioner was terminated on 07.01.2013, long before the date of filing of this writ petition. It is also stated that she was working only as a provisional part time sweeper and was not appointed after any selection process, as claimed in the writ petition. Now, a permanent part time sweeper has W.P.(C)No.1665 of 2013 :

2. : been appointed in the place of the petitioner. It was for the said reason that she has been terminated. The permanent appointment was made after applications were invited by the first respondent bank. As many as 252 persons had applied for the post. For the above reasons, it is contended that the petitioner has no right to continue in service.

3. Heard. It is not disputed that the petitioner was working as a Part Time Sweeper. Since she has been terminated on the appointment of a permanent employee, she has no right to complain. For the above reasons, I do not find any grounds to interfere with the impugned proceedings. This writ petition is accordingly dismissed. Sd/- K.SURENDRA MOHAN, JUDGE kkj