

APHC010279912024



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

[3541]

WEDNESDAY THE NINETH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO****THE HONOURABLE SMT JUSTICE SUMATHI JAGADAM****WRIT PETITION NO:14017 of 2024****Between:**

Ap Judicial Office Sub Ordinates Association

...PETITIONER**AND**

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1.B V ANJANEYULU

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.B VASANTHA LAKSHMI

2.GP FOR SERVICES I

The Court made the following Order:

(per Hon'ble Sri Justice R. Raghunandan Rao)

Heard Sri B.V. Anjaneyulu, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Smt. B. Vasantha Lakshmi, learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondents 2 and 3.

2. An Association, said to be representing the office sub-ordinates in the A.P. Judicial Services, is the petitioner in the present case. The

contentions raised in the present case are that the office sub-ordinates working in the District Courts, are being made to work as domestic workers and unofficial workers in the residences / quarters of the Judges, even though the Circular, dated 24.02.1992, issued by the Registrar (Administration), erstwhile combined High Court of Andhra Pradesh, did not include any domestic services. It is further contended that the office sub-ordinates, working in the residences of the Judges, are made to work beyond normal working hours in a day without any official leave being given to them. Certain incidents of office subordinates being forced to work beyond the normal hours and incidents of harassment by some judicial officers have also been raised in the present case. These incidents have been raised to contend that no domestic work can be given to office subordinates.

3. Sri B.V. Anjaneyulu, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner-Association would contend that the incidents pointed out in the writ petition are only indicative and not exhaustive. He would submit that in such circumstances, there is every need for a direction from this Court to prohibit such domestic service.

4. Respondents 2 and 3 have filed a counter affidavit contending that the Circular dated 24.02.1992 had been considered by two separate Division Benches of the erstwhile combined High Court of Andhra Pradesh, in the case of **T.M. Manikumar vs. Second Additional Junior Civil Judge,**

Guntur and Ors.,¹ and T.M. Mani Kumar vs. Registrar (Administration), High court of A.P., Hyderabad and Anr.,².Smt. Vasantha Lakshmi, the learned standing counsel appearing for the respondents would also contend that the writ petition is not maintainable as the petitioner association is not recognized and such an association cannot represent it's alleged members.

5. In **T.M. Manikumar vs. Second Additional Junior Civil Judge, Guntur and Ors.**, an office subordinate, who was deputed to the residence of a judicial Officer, had refused to attend the work at the residence of the officer and approached the Court contending that the circular did not include any domestic work and as such the petitioner could not be directed to work at the residence of the Judge. A Division Bench of High Court of Andhra Pradesh, after considering the said contention, had rejected the same.

6. Thereafter, the said office subordinate was dismissed from service by an order dated 28.08.2003. The said office subordinate, then, moved the erstwhile combined High Court of Andhra Pradesh by way of a writ petition in W.P.No.10521 of 2004 in **T.M. Mani Kumar vs. Registrar (Administration), High court of A.P., Hyderabad and Anr.**, In the said writ petition, the office subordinate listed out various directions given by the Presiding Officer, and contended that these directions, were more in the nature of domestic duties and the said office subordinate cannot be called upon to discharge such duties. A Division Bench of the erstwhile High Court of

¹ 2002 (2) ALD 428

² 2005 (6) ALD 346 (DB)

Andhra Pradesh, after considering these contentions and the additional contention that the Circular of 1992 was a bar against any domestic duties, being assigned to office subordinates, had held that such contentions were not acceptable and had dismissed the writ petition filed by the office subordinate.

7. In view of these judgments, it would have to be held that the Circular of 1992 is not an exhaustive list of the duties that are to be performed by office subordinates and other duties may also be given to the office subordinates. The practice in the District judiciary has been that a certain number of office subordinates are attached to the residences of the Judicial Officers for domestic duties. In such circumstances, the claim of the deponent to the affidavit that domestic duties are not part of the duties of the office subordinates cannot be accepted.

8. As far as individual complaints against the Judicial Officers regarding harassment meted out to office subordinates carrying out domestic duties are concerned, these are issues which can be raised on the administrative side and necessary steps would be taken on such complaints. Even otherwise, individual acts of alleged mis-behaviour by judicial officers would not mean that the basic duties that can be allotted to office subordinates can be changed.

9. For all the above reasons, there are no merits in the writ petition and the same is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

R. RAGHUNANDAN RAO, J

SUMATHI JAGADAM, J

Js.

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R. RAGHUNANDAN RAO
&
THE HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE SUMATHI JAGADAM

W.P.No.14017 of 2024

(per Hon'ble Sri Justice R. Raghunandan Rao)

9th July, 2025

Js