

* HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.GANGA RAO

+ Writ Petition Nos.31050, 31114,
31120, 31137 and 41257 of 2016

% 11-12-2017

W.P.No.31050 of 2016:

1. C.Prasad, S/o C.Govindappa, Aged 34 years, Occ: Unemployed,
R/o SRT 1-10-163/A, Ashok Nagar, Hyderabad-20

2. Ch.Jagannadha Rao, S/o Vitalappa, Aged 35 years,
Occ: Unemployed, R/o Ramavaram (V) and Post,
Gantyada Mandal, Vizianagaram District

3. T.Rajeshwari, D/o Vitalappa, Aged 30 years,
Occ: Commercial Tax Officer, Madapur Circle, 1st Floor,
Gaganvihar Building, Nampally, Hyderabad

... Petitioners

Vs.

\$ 1. The A.P. Public Service Commission, Rep. by its Secretary,
M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad

2. The State of A.P., Rep. by its Chief Secretary,
Dept. of Genl. Admn., Secretariat, Hyderabad

3. The TSPSC, Rep. by its Secretary,
M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad

4. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Chief Secretary,
Dept. of Genl. Admn., Secretariat, Hyderabad

5. The A.P.A.T., Rep. by its Registrar, Hyderabad

... Respondents

W.P.No.31114 of 2016:

Battula Pradeep Kumar, S/o late Prakasham, 30 years,
H.No.6-1-48, VDOs Colony, Khammam,
Khammam District, State of Telangana

... Petitioner

Vs.

\$ 1. A.P. Public Service Commission, Rep. by its Secretary,
M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad

2. Telangana Public Service Commission, Rep. by its Secretary,
M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad

3. State of A.P., Rep. by its Special Chief Secretary to Govt.,
GAD Dept., Secretariat Bldg., Hyderabad-22

4. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Spl. Chief Secretary to Govt.,
GAD Dept., Secretariat Bldg., Hyderabad-22

5. A.P. Administrative Tribunal, Rep. by its Registrar,
Puranahaveli, Hyderabad

... Respondents

W.P.No.31120 of 2016:

- # 1. Gowada Giribabu;, S/o Venkateswara Rao, 36 years,
Depot Manager, APSRTC, Machilipatnam,
R/o Flat No.102, Sri Krishna Residency, Vidya Nagar Colony,
Vijayawada, Krishna District
2. Yogesh Thandava, S/o Venkateswarlu, 31 years,
Unemployee, R/o H.No.8-17-180/3C, Sanjeevareddy Nagar,
8th Ward, Opp Krishna Theatre, Giddaluru, Prakasam Dist., A.P.
- ... Petitioners

Vs.

- \$ 1. A.P. Public Service Commission, Rep. by its Secretary,
M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad
2. Telangana Public Service Commission, Rep. by its Secretary,
M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad
3. State of A.P., Rep. by its Special Chief Secretary to Govt.,
GAD Dept., Secretariat Bldg., Hyderabad-22
4. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Spl. Chief Secretary to Govt.,
GAD Dept., Secretariat Bldg., Hyderabad-22
5. A.P. Administrative Tribunal, Rep. by its Registrar,
Purana Haveli, Hyderabad
- ... Respondents

W.P.No.31137 of 2016:

- # Chintala Sankar Reddy, S/o Venkat Ram Reddy, Aged 35 years,
Occ: Inspector of Police, CID, Lakadi-ka-pool, Hyderabad,
R/o 1-10-292/8, Lane No.6, Brahman Wadi, Begumpet, Hyderabad
- ... Petitioner

Vs.

- \$ 1. A.P. Public Service Commission, Rep. by its Secretary,
M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad
2. Telangana Public Service Commission, Rep. by its Secretary,
M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad
3. State of A.P., Rep. by its Special Chief Secretary to Govt.,
GAD Dept., Secretariat Bldg., Hyderabad-22
4. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Spl. Chief Secretary to Govt.,
GAD Dept., Secretariat Bldg., Hyderabad-22
5. A.P. Administrative Tribunal, Rep. by its Registrar,
Purana ,Haveli, Hyderabad
- ... Respondents

W.P.No.41257 of 2016:

Segu Shanmukha Ganesh Kumar, S/o S.Lakshmaiah, 36 years,
Divisional Accounts Officer, Flat No.427, B3 Block,
B.K. Singh Tower, Near Ayyappa Swamy Temple,
Kurnool, Kurnool District

... Petitioner

Vs.

\$ 1. A.P. Public Service Commission, Rep. by its Secretary,
M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad

2. Telangana Public Service Commission, Rep. by its Secretary,
M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad

3. State of A.P., Rep. by its Special Chief Secretary to Govt.,
GAD Dept., Secretariat Bldg., Hyderabad-22

4. State of Telangana, Rep. by its Spl. Chief Secretary to Govt.,
GAD Dept., Secretariat Bldg., Hyderabad-22

... Respondents

! Counsel for Petitioners in WP.31050/2016: Mrs. P.K. Kalyani

Counsel for Petitioners in WPs.31114, 31120, 31137 & 41257/2016:
Mr. P.V. Krishnaiah

Counsel for APPSC: Mr. M.Surender Rao, Senior Counsel,
Representing Mr. C.Srinivasa Baba,
Standing Counsel

Counsel for TSPSC: Mr. D.Balakishan Rao, Standing Counsel

Counsel for other official respondents: Government Pleaders for GAD
(AP) & (TS) & Services-I (AP) & (TS)

Counsel for APAT: ---

< Gist:

> Head Note:

? Cases referred:
Nil.

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.GANGA RAO

Writ Petition Nos.31050, 31114,
31120, 31137 and 41257 of 2016

Common Order: (per V.Ramasubramanian, J.)

While the first four writ petitions arise out of a common order passed by the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad, the last writ petition is filed challenging a revised examination schedule issued by the Andhra Pradesh Public Service Commission for appointment to 312 posts included in Group-I Services of the State.

2. Heard Smt. P.K. Kalyani and Sri P.V. Krishnaiah, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and Mr. M.Surender Rao, learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the A.P. Public Service Commission representing Mr.Srinivasa Baba and D.Balakrishna Rao.

3. Since the batch of cases on hand has a checkered history, it is necessary for us to record the timeline of events as follows:

(a) By a Notification No.15/2011, dated 30-6-2011, the A.P. Public Service Commission invited applications for appointment to various posts, exclusively reserved for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes towards backlog vacancies.

(b) By another Notification bearing No.18/2011, dated 28-11-2011, applications were invited by the Public Service

Commission for appointment to 312 posts included in the Group-I Services of the State.

(c) Preliminary examination in the form of a screening test comprising of 150 questions was conducted on 25-7-2012 and the results of the same were published on 13-6-2012.

(d) Immediately thereafter, a few candidates approached the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad, by filing original applications in which the Tribunal passed an interim order directing the Public Service Commission to publish the key answers.

(e) The key answers were published on 31-8-2012 and objections were invited.

(f) Thereafter, final key answers were published on 02-9-2012.

(g) Thereafter, a main written examination was conducted in five papers from 18-9-2012 to 29-9-2012.

(h) A batch of applications came to be filed again before the A.P. Administrative Tribunal questioning the correctness of some of the questions and some of the key answers.

(i) By an order dated 04-01-2013, the Tribunal directed the Public Service Commission to refer four questions to an Expert Committee.

(j) However, the Tribunal also permitted the Public Service Commission to proceed with the further process of selection.

(k) The decision of the Tribunal was carried to the High Court by way of writ petitions.

(l) But in the meantime, interviews were conducted from 28-01-2013 to 22-3-2013.

(m) A select list of candidates was also released.

(n) But the High Court put the appointments on hold and eventually the High Court passed orders in W.P.Nos.2392 and 6009 of 2013 on 26-7-2013, directing four doubtful questions to the Union Public Service Commission (UPSC), for its opinion.

(o) Contending that the autonomy granted to them under the Constitution got infringed by the orders of this Court referring the questions to the UPSC, the Public Service Commission took the matter on appeal to the Supreme Court in SLP (Civil) Nos.25157 and 25209 of 2013.

(p) By an order dated 07-10-2013, the Supreme Court disposed of the civil appeals C.A.Nos.9142 and 9143 of 2013 (equivalent to SLP (Civil) Nos.25157 and 25209 of 2013).

(q) By this order, the Supreme Court directed the Public Service Commission to delete six wrong questions and confine the valuation only to 144 questions.

(r) The Supreme Court further directed that upon fresh evaluation of the answer papers in the screening test for a maximum of 144 marks, the main written examination will have to be conducted *de novo*.

(s) The Public Service Commission thereafter filed miscellaneous applications in the disposed of civil appeals seeking modification.

(t) The modification sought by the Public Service Commission was to permit them to hold the main written examination only for 209 candidates who got declared as successful after the revaluation.

(u) By an order dated 20-01-2014, the Supreme Court modified the order permitting the Public Service Commission to restrict the participation in the fresh main written examination to approximately 16,000 candidates, who were declared passed, after excluding 7,711 candidates who chose not to appear.

(v) The Public Service Commission filed petitions for review, in R.P.(Civil) Nos.773, 774, 775 and 776 of 2014. The review petitions were dismissed.

(w) In the meantime, the composite State of Andhra Pradesh got bifurcated with effect from 02-6-2014 under the Andhra Pradesh Reorganization Act, 2014 (Act 6 of 2014).

(x) Therefore, the State of Andhra Pradesh and the A.P. Public Service Commission which alone were parties when the litigation started in 2011, were left without a clue.

(y) Therefore, several applications for impleadment and intervention were filed before the Supreme Court and a contempt petition was also filed for non-implementation of the orders dated 07-10-2013 and 20-01-2014.

(z) After allowing the applications for impleadment and the intervention, the Supreme Court passed an order in the contempt petition on 29-6-2016 directing the Governments of both the States and the Public Service Commissions of both the States to conduct a fresh main examination in terms of the final orders passed by the Supreme Court in the main civil appeals, within three months.

(aa) Accordingly, the Service Commission issued a Notification dated 04-8-2016, announcing a schedule for the conduct of the main written examination from 06-9-2016 to 17-9-2016.

(ab) Immediately, a group of persons including the petitioners herein rushed to the A.P. Administrative Tribunal and filed a batch of six original applications in O.A.Nos.3234, 3240, 3488, 3502, 3504 and 3519 of 2016.

(ac) The reliefs sought for in these original applications were of three types. The first type was for a declaration that the revised examination schedule was contrary to law and for

a consequential direction to the Service Commission and the State to complete the process of recruitment on the basis of the main written examinations conducted in September, 2012 and the interviews held in January to March, 2013. The second type of prayer made was to declare as illegal, the action of the Service Commissions of both the States in attempting to hold the main written examinations on the same day, without granting an opportunity to the candidates to write the examinations in both the States, with the benefit of local status in one State and under the open category in the other State. The third type of prayer made in the above batch of original applications was to set aside the eligibility list of candidates who were permitted to take part in the main examination scheduled to be held in September 2016, by taking 89 marks as cut-off marks, in view of the reduction in the number of vacancies from 312 as originally notified, to 245.

(ad) By a common order dated 12-9-2016, the A.P. Administrative Tribunal dismissed all the six original applications viz., O.A.Nos.3234, 3240, 3488, 3502, 3504 and 3519 of 2016.

(ae) Aggrieved by the said common order dated 12-9-2016, passed by the A.P. Administrative Tribunal in the batch of six original applications, the applicants in four original applications alone viz., O.A.Nos.3234, 3240, 3488

and 3519 of 2016 have come up with the writ petitions W.P.Nos.31050, 31114, 31120 and 31137 of 2016.

(af) The last writ petition W.P.No.41257 of 2016 has been filed, not against any orders of the A.P. Administrative Tribunal but directly on the file of this Court, challenging the revised examination schedule dated 04-8-2016 and for a consequential direction to finalise the process of selection on the basis of the main examination conducted in September, 2012 and the interviews conducted from January to March, 2013.

4. Thus, we have on hand five writ petitions, out of which four arise out of a common order passed by the A.P. Administrative Tribunal and one filed directly on the file of this Court, though praying for similar reliefs.

5. For the purpose of easy appreciation, the writ petition numbers, the corresponding original application numbers and the reliefs sought before the Tribunal are presented in a tabular column as follows:

W.P. No.	O.A. No.	Prayer in O.A.
31050/2016	3240/2016	To set aside the examination schedule, by which main examination was proposed to be conducted for both the States on the same date at the same time, depriving the candidates of the opportunity of taking the examination in both the States.
31114/2016	3234/2016	To set aside the examination schedule and to complete the process of selection pursuant to the interviews conducted from January, 2013 to March, 2013.
31137/2016	3519/2016	To set aside the revised examination schedule and to complete the process of selection on the basis of the interviews conducted from January to March, 2013.

31120/2016	3488/2016	To set aside the revised examination schedule and to declare the results of the selection on the basis of the interviews held in January to March, 2013.
------------	-----------	--

6. In the last writ petition W.P.No.41257 of 2016 which does not arise out of any order passed by the A.P. Administrative Tribunal, the relief sought is to set aside the revised examination schedule and to declare the results on the basis of the interviews held in January, 2013 to March, 2013.

7. From the two preceding paragraphs, it could be seen that the reliefs sought in three writ petitions arising out of the orders of the A.P. Administrative Tribunal and the relief sought in the last writ petition directly filed before this Court, are:

(i) to set aside the revised examination schedule announced on 04-8-2016 and

(ii) to declare the results on the basis of the main written examinations conducted in September, 2012 followed by interviews held from January to March, 2013.

8. We do not know how such a prayer is sought by the petitioners, especially when the Public Service Commissions of both the States were compelled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by its orders dated 07-10-2013, 20-01-2014 and 29-6-2016 to conduct a fresh main written examination.

9. To recapitulate, the Supreme Court by its order dated 07-10-2013 passed in Civil Appeal Nos.9140 to 9143 of 2013 directed the Service Commission to hold the main examination *de novo*. The operative portion of the order of the Supreme Court dated 07-10-2013 reads as follows:

“5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, we are of the view that these questions cannot be retained. That being so, the marks secured have to be recounted from the answer books written by all the candidates on the basis of 144 questions after deleting these six questions and their answers. Those who succeed after revaluation will be eligible for the main examination and the Andhra Pradesh Public Service Commission will hold the main examination *de novo* thereafter. On the basis of these 144 questions some new candidates may succeed or some candidates may fail. It will be the new list of candidates passing the examination of 144 marks who will take second main examination.”

10. By the next order dated 20-01-2014, passed in I.A.Nos.3 and 4 of 2014 in C.A.Nos.9140 to 9143 of 2013, the Supreme Court modified its earlier order dated 07-10-2013. Paragraph-7 of the order dated 20-01-2014 which contains the operative portion reads as follows:

“7. In the circumstances, we modify our order dated 07-10-2013 to this extent that it will be permissible to the A.P. Public Service Commission to restrict the participation in the main examination to be held now to the approximately 16,000 candidates who have passed the fresh preliminary examination after excluding the above referred 7711 candidates. We further add that there will be age relaxation in favour of the candidates if any, who have crossed the age bar, because of the litigation.”

11. After the aforesaid order dated 20-01-2014, the State got bifurcated. Therefore, applications for impleadment of the newly formed State Government and the Service Commission of that State Government were filed and they were allowed. A contempt petition was filed alleging non-implementation of the orders of the Supreme Court dated 07-10-2013 and 20-01-2014. This contempt petition was disposed of by the Supreme Court by order dated 29-6-2016. It will be useful to extract the order passed in the contempt petition in full, so that a clear picture is brought out.

“Application for permission to file contempt petition is allowed.

All applications for impleadment and intervention are allowed.

Subsequent to the final orders of this Court in Civil Appeal No.9140/2013, a significant event took place. The erstwhile State of Andhra Pradesh is divided into two parts bringing into existence two new States, i.e. State of Andhra Pradesh and State of Telangana. As a consequence, two separate service commissions for the above-mentioned two States have also been established.

Both the States and their respective service commissions are represented before us.

Learned counsel appearing for both the States and respective State Commissions submitted that they are ready to implement the orders passed by this Court, if only some reasonable time is granted to them. They also stated that the orders could not be implemented immediately in view of the above-mentioned significant developments.

Accepting the statements made by both the States and their respective State Commissions, we deem it appropriate to permit both the States to conduct a fresh examination in terms of the final orders of this Court in the

above-mentioned appeal within a period of three months from today.

One incidental question was projected before this Court. All the candidates who appeared in the earlier round of examination conducted by the erstwhile Public Service Commission of the State of Andhra Pradesh took examination on the basis of a notified syllabus along with the advertisement calling applications. However, subsequently, in view of the formation of a new State of Telangana, the candidates belonging to Telangana apprehend that they might be subjected to the examination on the basis of a new syllabus to be formulated by the State of Telangana. The learned counsel for the State of Telangana submitted that the State of Telangana is in fact contemplating such a process. He, however, submitted that having regard to the fact situation, the State of Telangana would not insist on such a proposal if this Court deems it just to direct otherwise. The candidates belonging to the State of Telangana submitted that they would be put to a great degree of hardship to prepare for the examination afresh on the basis of a new syllabus.

Having regard to the totality of the circumstances, we deem it appropriate to direct the State of Telangana and the Telangana State Public Service Commission to conduct the examination which should be based only on the syllabus as notified initially.

The contempt petitions stand disposed of accordingly.”

12. It is in pursuance of the three aforesaid orders of the Supreme Court dated 07-10-2013, 20-01-2014 and 29-6-2016 that the Service Commission issued the revised examination schedule on 04-8-2016 proposing to conduct the main written examination in five papers in September, 2016. It must be remembered that the revised examination schedule was issued by the Public Service Commissions, under threat

of contempt. Today by asking the Tribunal and this Court to set aside the revised examination schedule and to issue the select list of candidates on the basis of the examinations conducted in September, 2012 and the interviews conducted in January to March 2013, the writ petitioners are committing a contempt of Court, apart from inviting the Tribunal as well as this Court to commit contempt of the orders of the Supreme Court. Therefore, the writ petitions challenging the revised examination schedule issued on 04-8-2016 and seeking a consequential direction to the Service Commission to release the select list on the basis of the examination conducted in September, 2012 are completely frivolous and are actually liable to be dismissed with costs. However, since the petitioners herein claim to be unemployed and they have spent equivalent amount of time in the corridors of the Court as they have spent in preparing for the examinations, these writ petitions W.P.Nos.31114, 31120 and 31137 of 2016 as well as W.P.No.41257 of 2016 are dismissed without any order as to costs.

13. That leaves us with one writ petition W.P.No.31050 of 2016 arising out of O.A.No.3240 of 2016, where the prayer was for setting aside the revised examination schedule on the ground that the States of Telangana and Andhra Pradesh should not conduct the examination on the same day at the same time, as the same would deprive the petitioners of the

opportunity of writing the examinations in both the States, claiming the benefit of reservation for locals in one State and taking the examination under the open category as non-locals in the other State. This writ petition is also liable to be thrown out for three important reasons. They are:

(i) The selection which now forms the subject matter of the dispute, is in relation to a Notification issued way back in the year 2011, when the State was a composite State. The final decision of the Supreme Court dated 20-01-2014 was also rendered at a time when the State was a composite State. But the State got bifurcated with effect from 02-6-2014 which lead the Supreme Court to pass an order on 29-6-2016. None of these petitioners went before the Supreme Court making a request to direct the Service Commissions of both the States to conduct examinations on different dates at different points of time. Therefore, today they cannot raise this plea. If at all, they should have gone to the Supreme Court after the revised examination schedule was announced on 04-8-2016, seeking a modification of the order of the Supreme Court dated 29-6-2016.

(ii) The bifurcation of the State cannot be taken to be an enlargement of the rights that accrued to the petitioners to participate in the process of selection. After the bifurcation of the State, the vacancies got reduced and the petitioners had an opportunity to choose where they wanted to appear.

In any case, the petitioners appeared for selection to 312 posts in Group-I Services of the State, which comprised of 19 categories of posts. Out of these 19 categories of posts, at least 18 categories were indicated to be State-wide posts for which the reservation on the basis of local status in terms of the Presidential Order issued under Article 371-D of the Constitution of India did not apply. Paragraph-5 of the Notification No.18/2011, dated 28-11-2011, reads as follows:

“Reservation for local candidates is not applicable as per concerned Departmental Rules for Pc.Nos.01 to 18 except Pc.No.19.”

It is contended by Smt. P.K. Kalyani, learned counsel for the petitioners that inspite of the above prescription, allotment of the selected candidates to the posts covered by Post Code numbers 01 to 18, was contemplated to be done Zone-wise. Therefore, it is her contention that the petitioners would have had a choice of allotment in the ratio of 80:20. But this argument loses sight of the fact that the question of allotment will come only after selection. If there is no reservation for local candidates in the matter of selection, the ratio applied at the time of allotment, would not give them any right. Let us assume for a minute that the petitioners had a greater chance if they were permitted to appear in both States. Even then, the petitioners could not have gone to the Tribunal seeking this relief. They should have gone to the Supreme Court to modify or clarify the order dated 29-6-2016. Therefore, the

claim now made that the petitioners could have participated in one State as a local and another State as a non-local, is a bogey. Hence, the same is to be rejected.

(iii) In any case, the very same petitioners filed a writ petition in W.P.(SR).No.140820 of 2016. The prayer in the said writ petition was as follows:

“Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to pass any writ, order or direction more particulars writ of *Certiorari* calling for records relating to the orders of the Hon’ble Tribunal dt.4/1/2013 in O.A.No.7809/2012 and the consequent notification issued by Respondent No.1 on Website for conducting the main exams de novo from 6/9/2016 to 17/9/2016 by quashing the same and setting aside the same as erroneous, in violation of principles of natural justice, Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents No.1 and 3 to declare the selected list of the candidates who have qualified in interviews as per the Notification No.18/2011 dt.28/11/2011 to fill up 312 posts of Group-1 Services and further direct the respondents to appoint the qualified candidates as Group I officers from the date of their eligibility and quash the same.”

14. This writ petition was taken up along with W.P.Nos. 2392, 6009, 8931 and 23800 of 2016 by a Division Bench of this Court and dismissed by a common order passed on 22-8-2016. A special leave petition appears to have been filed as against the said order, but the same was also dismissed.

15. While the prayer made by the petitioners in W.P.No. 31050 of 2016 before the Tribunal in their original application

O.A.No.3240 of 2016 was for the conduct of examinations on different dates at different times, the prayer made in W.P.(SR).No.140820 of 2016 was to confine the selection to the written examinations conducted in 2012 and the oral interviews conducted in 2013.

16. In other words, the revised examination schedule was challenged by the petitioners in W.P.No.31050 of 2016 first before this Court on a different ground with a different prayer in W.P.(SR).No.140820 of 2016 and later before the A.P. Administrative Tribunal in O.A.No.3240 of 2016 with a modified prayer.

17. Apart from the fact that the said conduct on the part of the petitioners in W.P.No.31050 of 2016 was an abuse of the process of Court, the writ petition is also barred by the principles of constructive *res judicata*. It may be true that the principles of *res judicata* may not *per se* be applicable to writ petitions. But Courts have always applied principles analogous to *res judicata*, on the basis of the doctrine of finality to litigation. The petitioners failed to plead and seek in W.P.(SR).No.140820 of 2016, the prayer that they later made before the Tribunal in O.A.No.3240 of 2016. Therefore, the original application was actually barred on the principle of “ought and might”.

18. Hence, W.P.No.31050 of 2016 is also liable to be dismissed.

19. Accordingly, all the writ petitions are dismissed.
The miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in these writ
petitions shall stand closed. No costs.

V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J.

M.GANGA RAO, J.

11th December, 2017.
Ak



HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.GANGA RAO

Writ Petition Nos.31050, 31114,
31120, 31137 and 41257 of 2016
(per VRS, J.)



11th December, 2017.
(Ak)