

* HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
HON'BLE Ms. JUSTICE J.UMA DEVI

+ Writ Petition No.31391 of 2018

% Date: 10-9-2018

G.Govinda Lakshmi D/o Late G.N. Acharya,
Aged 40 years, IV Addl. Junior Civil Judge
(Juvenile Court), Warangal District, Telangana

... Petitioner

Vs.

\$ 1. High Court of Judicature at Hyderabad
(for the State of Telangana and the State of
Andhra Pradesh), Rep. by the Registrar General
FAC Registrar (Vigilance), Hyderabad

2. Registrar (Inquiries), High Court of Judicature at
Hyderabad (for the State of Telangana and the
State of Andhra Pradesh), Hyderabad

... Respondents

! Counsel for Petitioner: Mr. M.Surender Rao,
Senior Counsel, representing
Mr. Srinivasa Rao Madiraju

Counsel for Respondents 1&2: Mr. J.Anil Kumar,
Standing Counsel for High Court

< Gist:

> Head Note:

? Cases referred:
Nil.

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
HON'BLE Ms. JUSTICE J.UMA DEVI

Writ Petition No.31391 of 2018

Order: (per V.Ramasubramanian, J.)

Challenging a charge memo issued under Rule 20 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1991 and the proceedings ordering an enquiry into the charges, a Judicial Officer has come up with the above writ petition.

2. Heard Mr. M.Surender Rao, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner.

3. By the proceedings impugned in the writ petition, 3 articles of charges have been framed against the petitioner. The first charge relates to the alleged absence of the petitioner from 02-5-2016, after the expiry of Earned Leave for a period of about 25 days. The second charge relates to the tone and tenor of the explanation submitted by the petitioner to a memo issued to her calling for her explanation for her absence. The third charge relates to the alleged application for Casual Leave at the last minute, for attending some classes.

4. It is well settled that a charge memo can be challenged only on certain well established principles. The challenge to the charge memo can be entertained, if the charges are vague or if the authority who initiated the proceedings was not authorised by the Rules to issue the

charge memo or if the same imputations of misconduct form part of any other disciplinary proceedings or if the imputations of misconduct, even if admitted, would not tantamount to a misconduct.

5. The challenge of the petitioner to the charge memo is not on any of those grounds. This is not a case where the charges can be said to be vague and bald. This is not a case where an incompetent authority has issued a charge memo. This is not a case where the imputations, even if admitted, would not tantamount to a misconduct. Therefore, we see no reason to entertain the writ petition. Hence, it is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, shall stand closed. No costs.



V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN, J.

J.UMA DEVI, J.

10th September, 2018.
Ak

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE V.RAMASUBRAMANIAN
AND
HON'BLE Ms. JUSTICE J.UMA DEVI

Writ Petition No.31391 of 2018
(For Orders – per VRS, J.)



10th September, 2018.
(Ak)