

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND SIXTEEN
(21.04.2016)

PRESENT
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY
&
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K.JAISWAL

WRIT PETITION No.13395 of 2016

Between:

Mrs.Shaik Rasheeda

..... PETITIONER

AND

The State of Andhra Pradesh,
Rep.by its Principal Secretary,
School Education Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and 4 others

.....RESPONDENTS

Counsel for the Petitioner : **Mr.NAGA SRINIVASA RAO**
For **Mrs.E.T.MANJUSHAA**

Counsel for Respondents Nos.1 to 4 : **G.P.FOR SERVICES (AP)**

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY
&
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K.JAISWAL

WRIT PETITION No.13395 of 2016

JUDGMENT: (per Hon'ble Sri Justice C.V.Nagarjuna Reddy)

This writ petition is filed for certiorari to quash the order, dated 25.02.2016, in O.A.No.596 of 2016, on the file of the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad (for short "the Tribunal").

We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

The petitioner appeared for the post of Secondary Grade Teacher in Prakasam District. He belongs to B.C-E category. As she failed to get selected, she has filed the above mentioned O.A. While dismissing the said O.A., the Tribunal observed that as per the instructions of the learned Government Pleader, the petitioner has got 111.25 marks whereas the last selected woman candidate under B.C-E has got 112 marks and hence the petitioner cannot have any grievance.

The learned counsel for the petitioner while not disputing the above finding of the Tribunal has argued that in the selection process, certain women, who are non-locals, were treated as local candidates. He has further fairly conceded that this plea was not canvassed before the Tribunal.

In our opinion, as the writ petition is not an appeal against the order of the Tribunal, the petitioner cannot raise a question which was not raised before the Tribunal. Appropriate remedy for the petitioner is to file a review before the Tribunal, permitting him to raise the issue therein which is raised before this Court for the first time. With this liberty to the petitioner, the writ petition is dismissed.

As a sequel to dismissal of the Writ Petition, WPMP No.16753 of 2016, filed by the petitioner for interim relief, is disposed of as infructuous.

C.V.NAGARJUNA REDDY,J

M.S.K.JAISWAL,J

Date: 21.04.2016

Dsr