

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

The Hon'ble Sri Justice V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
and
The Hon'ble Sri Justice M. GANGA RAO

WRIT APPEAL No.1622 OF 2017

Between:

T. Kartik Reddy S/o.T. Ashok Reddy,
Age:34 years, Occ: Government Servant,
R/o.2-2-1136/ 1, Plot No.115, Shivam Road,
New Nallakunta, Hyderabad.

...Appellant

Vs.

The State of Telangana, Rep. by its
Chief Secretary to Government,
General Administration Department,
Secretariat, Hyderabad and others.

... Respondents

For Appellant : M s.T. Vijay Hanuman Singh

For Respondents : Sri D.Balakishan Rao
Sri N. Bharath Babu
Sri C. Srinivasa Baba



HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN

AND

HON' BLE SRI JUSTICE M. GANGA RAO

WRIT APPEAL No.1622 OF 2017

JUDGMENT: (per V. Ramasubramanian, J)

Aggrieved by the dismissal of his writ petition, challenging the non-inclusion of his name for interview to Group-I services of the State, the writ petitioner has come up with the above writ appeal.

2. Heard Mr. T. Vijay Hanuman Singh, learned counsel for the appellant.

3. On 28.11.2011, the Public Service Commission issued a notification calling for applications to Group-I services. A preliminary examination was conducted, but some of the questions became the subject matter of a challenge, which went up to the Supreme Court.

4. After the implementation of the order of the Tribunal, a fresh valuation was undertaken and thereafter, the candidates who were qualified for interview were short listed.

5. Unfortunately, the appellant attended only one paper, though he was obligated to appear in six papers, on 18.09.2012 and 28.09.2012. The Supreme Court in its order, dated 20.01.2014, quantified the candidates and directed the issuance of Hall Tickets and permitted to write the examinations. Pursuant to the said order, the appellant wrote one paper.

6. However, the appellant was not short listed for interview since he did not attend all the papers. Taking advantage of the fact that he was permitted by the orders of the Supreme Court to take one examination, the appellant filed a writ petition challenging the non-

inclusion of his name in the list of candidates short listed for interview. Finding that the appellant did not satisfy even the basic requirement of appearing in all the papers, the learned single Judge dismissed the writ petition.

7. We find nothing wrong in the dismissal of the writ petition. The most fundamental requirement of appearance in all the papers is not satisfied by the appellant.

8. Hence, the Writ Appeal is dismissed. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending shall stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

V. RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J

M. GANGA RAO, J

November 03, 2017

CTL

