

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

* HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE T. RAJANI

+ WRIT PETITION No.30172 of 2017

% Date: 07-09-2017

Between:

Chandra Sekhar Yandra S/o. Late Janardhana Rao,
Advocate by profession, R/o. D.No.50-106-2/2, Seetammadhara,
Visakhapatnam Town & District.

... Petitioners

And

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by Chief Secretary, General Administration (SC.F) Department, Secretariat Buildings, Valagapudi, Amaravathi, Guntur District.
2. The State of Telangana, rep. by its Chief Secretary, General Administration (SC.F) Department, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
3. The High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad for the State of Telangana and the State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Registrar (Administration) FAC Registrar (Recruitment).
4. The Registrar (Recruitment) High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad for the State of Telangana and the State of Andhra Pradesh.

... Respondents

! Counsel for the Petitioner : Mr. G. Venkat Reddy

^ Counsel for Respondent No.1 : G.P. for General Administration (A.P)

^ Counsel for Respondent No.2 : G.P. for General Administration (T.G)

< LIST:

> HEAD NOTE:

? Cases referred

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN

And

HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE T. RAJANI

WRIT PETITION No.30172 of 2017ORDER: (Per VRS,J)

The application of the petitioner for direct recruitment to the post of District Judge was rejected on the ground that he was implicated in a criminal case. Aggrieved by the said rejection, the petitioner is before us.

2. Heard Mr. G. Venkat Reddy, learned counsel for the petitioner.

3. Even admittedly, the petitioner's wife has lodged a complaint for an offence under Section 498A I.P.C. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the notification bars only those who have been convicted for a criminal offence, we do not think that the Registry was wrong in rejecting the candidature of persons who were involved in criminal cases. Appointments to the post of judicial officers stand on a different footing from the appointments to other services. It will be impossible for a person, after appointment as a judicial officer, to face an investigation or trial into a criminal complaint. The system itself comes under cloud when allegations and counter allegations are made after appointment. Therefore, we see no reason to interfere with the decision of the respondents. Hence the writ petition is dismissed.

4. As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending in this writ petition, if any, shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J.

T. RAJANI, J.

7th September, 2017.
Js.

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
HON'BLE SMT JUSTICE T. RAJANI

W.P.No.30172 of 2017
(Per VRS,J)



7th September, 2017

Js.