Date of reserved for orders :
Date of pronouncement : 09-07-2026
Date of uploading :

APHC010026072026

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

THURSDAY, THE 9th DAY OF JULY 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

WRIT PETITION NO: 1798/2026

Between:

Smt.P Radhika **...PETITIONER**

AND

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

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. SRINIVAS AMBATI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. RAGHU BABU KALAMATA SC For Samagra Siksha
2. GP FOR SERVICES III

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

W.P.No.1798 of 2026

O R D E R:

The present Writ Petition is filed questioning the action of the respondent No.4 in terminating the Petitioner from the post of Principal in Kasturiba Gandhi Balika Vidyalayas (KGBVs) at Kotturu Mandal, Srikakulam District vide Proceedings in Rc.No.216756/H/SS/SKLM/2022, dated 03.10.2025, as illegal and arbitrary.

2. The Petitioner was initially appointed as a Contract Residential Teacher (Maths) in the Kasturba Gandhi Balika Vidyalaya at Gara Mandal, Srikakulam District, and thereafter she was promoted as Principal. A news item was published against the Petitioner in the Nizam Newspaper on 23.07.2025, and a video was circulated regarding the unofficial transportation of rice and other provisions from the KGBV. Pursuant thereto, the Petitioner was issued a Show Cause Notice on 23.09.2025 calling for an explanation. On 25.09.2025, the Petitioner submitted her explanation, explaining her innocence regarding the allegations made therein. Pursuant thereto, the impugned Order came to be passed on 03.10.2025, and the only reason assigned in the impugned Order was that the Respondents were not satisfied with the explanation submitted by the Petitioner. Hence, the present Writ Petition.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that no enquiry nor reasons were assigned in the impugned Order and as the impugned Order is stigmatic, a reasonable opportunity should have

been provided to the Petitioner to establish her innocence. While advancing the arguments, the learned counsel for the Petitioner relied upon a coordinate bench Judgment of this Court in W.P.No.36620 of 2025, whereunder the punishment imposed against the Petitioner therein with regard to the said incident was set aside as the impugned Order of termination was passed without conducting any enquiry with regard to the allegations levelled against the Petitioner therein.

4. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents submits that widespread newspaper reports revealed that the rice bags meant for the students' midday meal scheme in the KGBV schools had been largely misappropriated and that several newspapers had reported the illegal storage of the said rice bags. It is further submitted that the Tahsildar of Kotturu Mandal conducted a field inspection on 20.09.2025 and concluded that there were serious lapses in stock management. It is submitted that the impugned proceedings were issued only after conducting an enquiry and that, since the petitioner was engaged on a contractual basis with the respondents, he cannot claim any relief from this Court.

5. Heard the learned counsel for petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents. Perused the material on record.

6. The enquiry conducted by the Tahsildar on 20.09.2025 was concluded on the very same day. A perusal of the report submitted by the Tahsildar would disclose that it was merely an inspection report prepared on 20.09.2025. Curiously, the impugned

proceedings do not refer to any enquiry having been conducted with respect to the charges allegedly framed against the petitioner. It is also pertinent to note that no formal charges were framed against the petitioner and no regular enquiry was conducted by the respondents before imposing the severe punishment of termination from service. Any punishment imposed by an authority on any employee would have to follow the due process of law and the principles of natural justice.

7. On the facts of the present case, it is evident that the respondents have merely relied upon the newspaper reports and proceeded to impose the punishment of termination of services upon the petitioner without conducting any proper enquiry. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, the impugned proceedings are liable to be set aside and the petitioner is entitled to reinstatement into service.

8. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is allowed with the following directions:

i) The Respondents are directed to reinstate the Petitioner into service.

ii) The Respondents are at liberty to conduct a fresh enquiry, if so advised, after putting the Notice on the Petitioner.

iii) There shall be no order as to costs.

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

_____

NYAPATHY VIJAY, J

Date: 09.07.2026

Whether the order is:

Speaking		Reasoned	
Reportable		Non-reportable	

eha

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

W.P.No.1798 of 2026

Dated: 09.07.2026

eha