

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

WEDNESDAY, THE THIRTY FIRST DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE APARESH KUMAR SINGH
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE G.M. MOHIUDDIN

WRIT APPEAL NOS: 18, 74, 106 AND 167 OF 2025

W.A.NO: 18 OF 2025

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent preferred against the order dated 20/12/2024 in W.P.No. 28639 of 2024 on the file of the High Court.

Between:

1. Bumbathula Sravan Kumar, S/o. Kishan, Aged about 25 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o.11.No. 372 Near Grampanchayat Office, Vempalli Village, Hajipur Mandal, Mancherla District, Telangana 504209 H.T.No.2311800496
2. Aloori Rajashekar, S/o. A I3hadraiah, Aged about 28 years, Occ.Unemployed, R/o.11.No.120, Vitayipally, Amangal, Rangareddy-509321 H.T.No.2311701902
3. Kitha Janaki Ramulu, S/o. Nageshwar Rao, Aged about 35 years, Occ. I3111.1. Employee, R/o. Flat.No. S2 SSS Ram Arcade, Venkateshwar Colony, Sheela Nagar, Vishakaptnam-530012 H.T.No.2311701291
4. Kanapaka Sportcus, S/o. Kanapaka Alexander, Aged about 30 years Occ.AE SCCL, R/o.11.No.485. Annojiguda, Ghatkesar Mandal, Medchal Malkajgiri-500088 H.T.No.2311802487
5. Peram Sri Nikitha, D/o. Peram Roshaiah Aged about 26 years Occ. Unemployed, R/o.H.No.28406 Sundhar Nagar, Miryalaguda, Nalgonda-508207 H.T.No.2311700901

...APPELLANTS/

RESPONDENTS 6,8,10,12,13 IN WP.No.28639 OF 2024

AND

1. Telangana Public Service Commission, Rep by its Secretary Prathibha Bhavan, M J Road, Nampally, Hyderabad - 500001
2. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary to Government General Administration Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
3. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary to Government Transport Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad
4. Commissioner of Transport Transport Department, Khairatabad, Hyderabad
5. Osmania General Hospital, Rep by its Superintendent, Afial Gunj, Hyderabad

...RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS IN WP.No.28639 OF 2024

6. Khethavaiah Roja, D/o. K LaluNaik, Aged about 29 years, Occ. Senior Section Engineer in Southern Railways, R/o.H.No.462 Rallavaguthanda, Damaracharla Mandal Kondrapol, Nalgonda-508355, H. No.- 2311700547.
7. Aredla Mahidhar Reddy, S/o. A Gopal Reddy, Aged about 28 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o. H.No.511234/2, Shanthinagar colony, Nalgonda-508001, H.T. No. 2311700170
8. K Srinidhi. S/o. K Narendar Reddy, Aged about 24 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o.Flat No.401, Sri Lalitha Homes, Plot No. 06, Road No. 04, phase-2, I lastinapuram, East Hyderabad, H.T.No - 2311700362.
9. Mittapally Srinivas, S/o.Pentaiah, Aged about 29years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o.H.No.125, Scetharampally, Siddipet, Telangana -502107, H.T. No 2311700427.
10. Thari Jessica Flourance, D/o. T Babu Rao, Aged about 31 years, Occ. Panchayath Secretary, R/o. H.No. 7/232 Chaitanya Nagar, Road no. 7 Miryalaguda, Nalgonda District- 508207, H.T. No.- 2311700292
11. Sindhu Tejavath, D/o.NanduTejovath, Aged about 27years, Occ.Unemployed, R/o.H.No.8415/90, Sapthagiri Colony, Miyapur, Hyderabad, RangaReddy - 500049 H.T.No. - 2311701757
12. Billam Teja Rao, S/o.Billam Surender Rao, Aged about 31 years, Occ. Transport Constable, R/o .H. No.5 1151/25/fl Priyadarshininagar Nirmal, H.T. No- 2311802059
13. Bavandla Saikumar, S/o. BavandlaAnjaneyulu, Aged about 29 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o.H.No.-1113, Gattuppal Village and Mandal, Nalgonda District, - 508253, H.T. No.- 2311700445
14. Sravya Thallapally, D/o. T.Rajesham Goud, Aged about 29 years, Occ. Forest Section Officer, R/o. H.No. 42605, Backside Renukayellamma Temple. Shivanagar, Allwyn colony, phase -1, Jagathgirugutta, Hyderabad -500037 H.T.No. 2311802661.

...RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS IN WP.No.28639 OF 2024

15. P. Chandan, S/o. P.Ravinder Aged about 32 years, Occ. Chief Depot Material Supdt. In SC Railways, R/o. 11.No. 3535/A/1/13, Shanthinagar, Sirsilla, Karimnagar-505301
16. B. Navitha, D/o B Mangilal Aged about 30 years, Occ .Sub Inspector of Police R/o.H.No.17161/1F12, Krupadeep Apartments, South Kamala Nagar, ECU, X Roads, Hyderabad-500062

(As per C.O dated 20.12.2024 vide IA.No.13 of 2024 Respondents is withdrawn)

17. Badavath Mounika, D/o. Badavath Venkanna Aged about 30 years, Occ.Unemployed R/o.H.No.4137, Poosala Thanda, Edjerla Maripeda, Mahboobabad-506315
18. Pogaku Sravanthi, D/o. Ranga Reddy, Aged about 29 years, Occ. Government Employee, R/o. Burgupally Koilkonda, Mahabubnagar District, H. No.- 2311700966, GRI. Rank 627, EWS.

Note - (Respondents No.15 to 18 formal parties as they were Respondents in the main Writ Petition but are not prosecuting the Writ Appeal)

...RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS IN WP.No.28639 OF 2024

IA NO: 2 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to suspend the operation of the Learned Single Judge in Writ Petition No. 28639 of 2024 order dated 20.12.2024 so as to enable the official Respondents to finalize the selection in so far as the Appellants are concerned.

IA NO: 3 OF 2025**Between:**

1. Khethavath Roja, D/o. K LaluNaik, Aged about 29 years, Occ. Senior Section Engineer in Southern Railways, R/o.H.No.462 Rallavaguthanda, Damaracharla Mandal Kondrapol, Nalgonda-508355, H. No.- 2311700547.
2. Aredla Mahidhar Reddy, S/o. A Gopal Reddy, Aged about 28 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o. H.No.511234/2, Shanthinagar colony, Nalgonda-508001, H.T. No. 2311700170
3. K Srinidhi, S/o. K Narendar Reddy, Aged about 24 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o.Flat No.401, Sri Lalitha Homes, Plot No. 06, Road No. 04, phase-2, I lastinapuram, East Hyderabad, H.T.No - 2311700362.
4. Mittapally Srinivas, S/o.Pentaiah, Aged about 29years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o.H.No.125, Scetharampally, Siddipet, Telangana -502107, H.T. No 2311700427.
5. Thari Jessica Flourance, D/o. T Babu Rao, Aged about 31 years, Occ. Panchayath Secretary, R/o. H.No. 7/232 Chaitanya Nagar, Road no. 7 Miryalaguda, Nalgonda District- 508207, H.T. No.- 2311700292
6. Sindhu Tejovath, D/o.NanduTejovath, Aged about 27years, Occ.Unemployed, R/o.H.No.8415/90, Sapthagiri Colony, Miyapur, Hyderabad, RangaReddy - 500049 H.T.No. - 2311701757
7. Billam Teja Rao, S/o.Billam Surender Rao, Aged about 31 years, Occ. Transport Constable, R/o .H. No.5 1151/25/fl Priyadarshininagar Nirmal, H.T. No- 2311802059
8. Bavandla Saikumar, S/o. BavandlaAnjaneyulu, Aged about 29 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o.H.No.-1113, Gattuppal Village and Mandal, Nalgonda District, - 508253, H.T. No. - 2311700445
9. Sravya Thallapally, D/o. T.Rajesham Goud, Aged about 29 years, Occ. Forest Section Officer, R/o. H.No. 42605, Backside Renukayellamma Temple. Shivanagar, Allwyn colony, phase -1, Jagathgirugutta, Hyderabad -500037 H.T.No. 2311802661.

...PETITIONERS/
RESPONDENTS/PETITIONERS IN WP.No.28639 OF 2024

AND

1. Bumbathula Sravan Kumar, S/o. Kishan, Aged about 25 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o.11.No. 372 Near Grampanchayat Office, Vempalli Village, Hajipur Mandal, Mancherla District, Telangana 504209 H.T.No.2311800496
2. Aloori Rajashekar, S/o. A I3hadraiah, Aged about 28 years, Occ.Unemployed, R/o.11.No.120, Vitayipally, Amangal, Rangareddy-509321 H.T.No.2311701902

3. Kitha Janaki Ramulu, S/o. Nageshwar Rao, Aged about 35 years, Occ. I3111.1. Employee, R/o. Flat.No. S2 SSS Ram Arcade, Venkateshwar Colony, Sheela Nagar, Vishakaptnam-530012 H.T.No.2311701291
4. Kanapaka Sportcus, S/o. Kanapaka Alexander, Aged about 30 years Occ.AE SCCL, R/o.11.No.485. Annojiguda, Ghatkesar Mandal, Medchal Malkajgiri-500088 H.T.No.2311802487
5. Peram Sri Nikitha, D/o. Peram Roshaiiah Aged about 26 years Occ. Unemployed, R/o.H.No.28406 Sundhar Nagar, Miryalaguda, Nalgonda-508207 H.T.No.2311700901

**...RESPONDENTS/APPELLANTS/
RESPONDENTS IN WP.No.28639 OF 2024**

6. P. Chandan, S/o. P.Ravinder Aged about 32 years, Occ. Chief Depot Material Supdt. In SC Railways, R/o. 11.No. 3535/A/1/13, Shanthinagar, Sirsilla, Karimnagar-505301
7. B. Navitha, D/o B Mangilal Aged about 30 years, Occ .Sub Inspector of Police R/o.H.No.17161/1F12, Krupadeep Apartments, South Kamala Nagar, ECU, X Roads, Hyderabad-500062
8. Badavath Mounika, D/o. Badavath Venkanna Aged about 30 years, Occ.Unemployed R/o.H.No.4137, Poosala Thanda, Edjerla Maripeda, Mahboobabad-506315
9. Pogaku Sravanthi, D/o. Ranga Reddy, Aged about 29 years, Occ. Government Employee, R/o. Burgupally Koilkonda, Mahabubnagar District, H. No.- 2311700966, GRI. Rank 627, EWS.

Note - (Respondents No.15 to 18 formal parties as they were Respondents in the main Writ Petition but are not prosecuting the Writ Appeal)

...RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS IN WP.No.28639 OF 2024

10. Telangana Public Service Commission, Rep by its Secretary Prathibha Bhavan, M J Road, Nampally, Hyderabad - 500001
11. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary to Government General Administration Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
12. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary to Government Transport Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad
13. Commissioner of Transport Transport Department, Khairtabad, Hyderabad
14. Osmania General Hospital, Rep by its Superintendent, Afial Gunj, Hyderabad

...RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS IN WP.No.28639 OF 2024

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to vacate the interim order dated 06.01.2025 in W.A.No.18 of 2025 and also dismiss the writ appeal with exemplary costs.

**Counsel for the Appellants: SRI GODÁ SIVA, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI B. ARJUN**

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: SRI P.S.RAJASEKHAR, SC FOR TGPSC

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.2 TO 5: GP FOR SERVICES-II

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.6 TO 14: SRI J.SUDHEER

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.15 TO 18: --

W.A.NO: 74 OF 2025

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent Preferred Against The
Order Dated 20/12/2024 in W.P.No.28639/2024 on the file of the High Court.

Between:

Pogaku Sravanthi, D/o. Ranga Reddy, Aged 29 years, Occ Government
Employee, R/o. Burgupally, Koilkonda, Mahabubnagar District, HT No
2311700966, GRL Rank 627 EWS

...APPELLANT/RESPONDENT No.14

AND

1. Telangana Public Service Commission, Rep by its Secretary, Prathibha Bhavan, M J Road, Nampally, Hyderabad-500001.
2. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary to Government, General Administration Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
3. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary to Government, Transport Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad
4. Commissioner of Transport, Transport Department, Khairatabad, Hyderabad.
5. Osmania General Hospital, Rep by its Superintendent, Afzal Gunj, Hyderabad

...RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS

6. Khethavath Roja, D/o K LaluNaik, Aged about 29 years, Occ Senior Section Engineer in Southern Railways, R/o. H.No.462 Rallavaguthanda, Damaracharla Mandal, Kondrapol, Nalgonda 508355 H.T.No.2311700547
7. Aredla Mahidhar Reddy, S/o A Gopal Reddy, Aged about 28 years Occ Unemployed, R/o H.No.511234/2 Shanthinagar colony Nalgonda 508001 H.T. No.2311700170
8. K Srinidhi, D/o K Narendar Reddy Aged about 24 years Occ unemployed R/o Flat no 401 Sri Lalitha homes plot no 06 Road No 04 phase 2 Hastinapuram East Hyderabad, H.T.No.2311700362
9. Mittapally Srinivas, S/o Pentaiah, Aged about 29 years Occupation Unemployed R/o H.No.125 seetharampally Siddipet Telangana 502107 H T No 2311700427
10. Thari Jessica Flourance, D/o T Babu Rao Aged about 31 years Occ Panchayath Secretary R/o H.No. 7/232 Chaitanya Nagar Road no 7 Miryalaguda Nalgonda District 508207 H T No 2311700292
11. Sindhu Tej ovath, D / o Nandu Tej ovath Aged about 27years Occ Unemployed R/o H No 8415/90 sapthagiri colony Miyapur Hyderabad RangaReddy 500049 H T No 2311701757
12. BillamTeja Rao, S/o Billam Surender Rao Aged about 31 years, Occ transport constable R/ o 51151/25/ fl Priyadarshininagar Nirmal H T No 2311802059
13. Bavandla Saikumar, S/o Bavandla Anjaneyulu Aged about 29 years Occ Unemployed R/o H.No.1113 Gattuppal V and M Nalgonda District 508253 H T No 2311700445

14. Sravya Thallapally, D/o T Rajeshám Goud Aged about 29 years Occ Forest section officer R/o H.No.42605 backside Renukayellamma temple Shivanagar Allwyn co ony phase 1 Jagathgirugutta Hyderabad500037 H.T.No. 2311802661

...RESPONDENTS/ WRIT PETITIONERS No.1 TO 9

15. Kitha Janaki Ramulu, S/o Nageshwar Rao Aged about 35 years, Occupation BHEL Employee R/o Flat No S2 SSS Ram Arcade Venkateshwar Colony Sheela Nagar Vishakaptnam-530012
16. P Chadan, S/o P Ravinder Aged about 32 years Occ Chief Depot Material Supt SC Railways R/o H No 3535/A/1/B Shanthinagar Sirsilla Karimnagar 505301

(As per C.O. dated 20.12.2024 vide IA 13 of 2024 Respondent is Withdrawn)

17. Kanapaka Sportcus, S/o Kanapaka Alexander Aged about 30 years Occ AE SCCL R/o H.No. 485 Annojiguda Ghatkesar Mandal Medchal Malkajgiri-500088
18. B Navitha D/o B Mangilal Aged about 30 years Occ SubInspector of Police R/o H No 17161/1F12 Krupadeep Apartments South Kamala nagar ECIL X Roads Hyderabad 500062

(As per CO dated 20.12.2024 vide IA 13 of 2024 Respondent is Withdrawn)

19. Peram Sri Nikitha, D/o Peram Roshaiyah Aged about 26 years Occ Unemployed R/o H.No.28406 Sundhar Nagar Miryalaguda Nalgonda-508207
20. Badavath Mounika, D/o Badavath Venkanna Aged about 30 years Occ Unemployee R/o H.No.4137 Poosala Thanda Edjerla Maripeda Mahboobabad-506315
21. Bumbathula Sravan Kumar, S/o Kishan, Aged about 25, Occ Unemployed R/o H No 372 Near Grampanchayat Office Vempalli Village Hajipur Mandal Mancheria District Telangana 504209
22. Aloori Rajashekar, S/o A Bhadraiah Aged about 28 years Occupation Unemployee R/o H No 120 Vitayipally Amangal Rangareddy-509321

...RESPONDENTS/PROFORMA PARTIES

IA NO: 2 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to SUSPEND the orders dated 20.12.2024 in WP No.28639 of 2024 with a direction to appoint the petitioner/Appellant in pursuance of section list.

Counsel for the Appellant: SRI G.VIDYA SAGAR, SENIOR COUNSEL FOR
SRI SAI PRASEN GUNDAVARAM
Counsel for the Respondent No.1: SRI P.S.RAJASEKHAR, SC FOR TGPSC
Counsel for the Respondent No.2: Ms. M.SHALINI, GP FOR SERVICES-II
Counsel for the Respondent Nos.3 & 4: GP FOR TRANSPORT
Counsel for the Respondent No.5: GP FOR FAMILY HEALTH & WF
Counsel for the Respondent Nos.6 TO 14: SRI J.SUDHEER
Counsel for the Respondent Nos.15 TO 19 & 22: SRI MOHD BASEER RIYAZ
Counsel for the Respondent No.20: SRI GODA SIVA, SENIOR COUSEL FOR
SRI B.ARJUN

W.A.NO: 106 OF 2025

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent Preferred Against Order
Dated 20/12/2024 in WP.No.28639 of 2024. on the file of the High Court.

Between:

Sindhu Tejovath, D/o. Nandu Tejovath, aged about 27 years, Occ.
Unemployee, R/o. H.No.8415/90, Sapthagiri Colony, Miyapur, Hyderabad,
Ranga Reddy District-500 049. H.T. No. 231170757.

**...APPELLANT/
PETITIONER No.6**

AND

1. Telangana Public Service Commission, Rep. by its Secretary, Prathibha Bhavan, M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad.
2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary to Government, General Administration Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
3. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary to Government, Transport Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
4. Commissioner of Transport, Transport Department, Khairatabad, Hyderabad.
5. Osmania General Hospital, Rep. by its Superintendent, AfizalGunj, Hyderabad.
6. Kitha Janaki Ramulu, S/o. Nageshwar Rao, aged about 35 years, Occ. BHEL Employee, R/o. Flat No. S2 SSS Ram Arcade, Venkateshwar Colony, Sheela Nagar, Visakhapatnam-530 012. H.T. No. 2311701291.
7. P. Chandan,, S/o. P. Ravinder, aged about 32 years, Occ. Chief Depot Material Superintendent in S.C. Railways, R/o. H. No. 3535/A/1/B, Shanthinagar, Sirsilla, Karimnagar-505 301.
8. Kanapaka Sportcus, S/o. Kanapaka Alexander, aged about 30 years, Occ. AE, SCCL, R/o. H. No. 485, Annojiguda, Ghatkesar Mandal, Medchal-Malkajgiri District-500 088. H.T. No. 2311802487.
9. B. Navitha, D/o. B. Mangilal, aged about 30 years, Occ. Sub Inspector of Police, R/o. H.No. 17161/F12, Krupadeep Apartments, South Kamala Nagar, ECIL 'X' Road, Hyderabad-500 062.
10. Peram Sri Nikitha, D/o. PeramRoshaiiah, aged about 26 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o. H.No. 28406, Sundhar Nagar, Miryalguda, Nalgonda-509 207. Hall Ticket No. 2311700901.
11. Badavath Mounika, D/o. Badavath Venkanna, aged about 30 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o. H.No. 4137, PoosalaThanda, Edjerla Maripeda, Mahaboobabad, Pin. 506 315.
12. Bumbathula Sravan Kumar, S/o. Kishan, aged about 25 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o. H.No. 372, Near Gram Panchayat Office, Vempally Village,

Hajipur Manda, Mancherial District, Telangana-504 209. Hall Ticket No. 2311800496.

13. Aloori Rajeshekar, S/o. A. Bhadraiah, aged about 28 years, Occ. Unemployed, R/o. H.No. 120, Vitayipally, Amangal, Ranga Reddy District-509 321. Hall Ticket No. 2311701902.
14. Pogaku Sravanthi, D/o. Ranga Reddy, aged about 29 years, Occ. Government Employee, R/o. Burgupally Koilkonda, Mahabubnagar District. GRL Rank -627, EWS, H.T. No. 2311700966.

(The Respondents No. 7 and 9 herein are not necessary parties to this Writ Appeal, since they were with-drawn as per order of this Honourable Court in W.P. No. 28639 of 2024)

...RESPONDENTS/RESPONDENTS

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the respondents 1 to 3, to reserve one post to the Petitioner herein in the category of ST (Woman) in Multi-Zone-II, pending disposal of the above Writ Appeal.

IA NO: 2 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to direct the 1st Respondent-to conduct re-medical examination to the Petitioner herein by an appropriate Medical Board, pending disposal of the above Writ Appeal.

**Counsel for the Appellant: SRI T.SURYA KARAN REDDY, SENIOR COUNSEL
FOR SRI GOURARAM RAJASHEKAR REDDY**
Counsel for the Respondent No.1: SRI P.S.RAJASEKHAR, SC FOR TGpsc
Counsel for the Respondent Nos.2 & 5: Ms. M.SHALINI, GP FOR SERVICES-II
Counsel for the Respondent Nos.3 & 4: GP FOR TRANSPORT
Counsel for the Respondent No.6 TO 12 & 13: SRI MOHD. BASHEER RIYAZ
Counsel for the Respondent No.11: SRI U.SANTOSH KUMAR
**Counsel for the Respondent No.14: SRI G.VIDYA SAGAR, SENIOR COUNSEL
FOR SRI SAI PRASEN GUNDAVARAM**

W.A.NO: 167 OF 2025

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent preferred against the order dated 20/12/2024 in W.P.No.28639 of 2024 and pass on the file of the High Court.

Between:

Telangana Public Service Commission (TGPSC), Rep. by its Secretary, M.J. Road, Nampally, Hyderabad, Telangana State.

**...APPELLANT/RESPONDENT No.1
IN W.P.No.28639 OF 2024**

AND

1. Khethavath Roja, D/o K Lalu Naik Aged 29 years, Occ Senior Section Engineer in Southern Railways, R/o H.No.4-62, Rallavaguthanda Damaracharla Mandal, Kondraprol Nalgonda-508355
2. Aredla Mahidhar Reddy, S/o A Gopal Reddy Aged about 28 years, Occ Unemployed, R/o H.No5-11-234/2, Shanthi Nagar Colony, Nalgonda-508001
3. K Srinidhi, D/o K Narendra Reddy, Aged about 24 years, Occ Unemployed, Plot no 06, Road no 04, Phase 2, Hastinapuram East, Hyderabad
4. Mittapally Srinivas, S/o Pentaiah, Aged about 29years, Occ.Unemployed, R/o.H.No.1-25,Seetharampally, Siddipet, Telangana-502107
5. Thari Jessica Flourance, D/o T Babu Rao Aged about 31 years, Occ.Panchayath Secretary, R/o. H.No.7/232, Chaitanya nagar, Road No.7, Miryalaguda, Nalgonda District-508207
6. Sindhu Tejovath, D/o NanduTejovath, Aged about 27 years, Occ.Unemployed, R/o. H.No 8-415/90, Sapthagiri Colony, Miyapur, Hyderabad, Rangareddy-500049
7. BillamTeja Rao, S/o. Billam Surender Rao, Aged about 31 years, Occ.Transport Constable, R/o.H.No.5-11-51/25/F1, Priyadarshininagar, Nirmal
8. Bavandla Sai Kumar, S/o Bavandla Anjaneyulu Aged about 29 years, Occ.Unemployed, R/o H.No 1-113, Gattuppal(V and M) Nalgonda Dist-508253
9. Sravya Thallapally, D/o. T.Rajesham Goud Aged about 29 Years, Occ. Forest Section Officer, R/o. H No. 42-605,Backside RenukaYellamma temple, Shiva nagar, Allwyn colony Phase-1, Jagathgirigutta, Hyderabad-500037
10. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary to Govt., General Administration Department, Secretariat Hyderabad
11. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary to Govt., Transport Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad
12. Commissioner of Transport, Transport Department Khairatabad Hyderabad
13. Osmania General Hospital, Rep by itsSuperintendent Afzal Gunj Hyderabad
14. Kitha Janaki Ramulu, S/o Nageshwar Rao Aged about 35 years, Occupation. BHEL Employee R/o Flat No S2 SSS Ram Arcade Venkateshwar Colony Sheela Nagar Vishakaptnam 530012
15. Kanapaka Sportcus, S/o Kanapaka Alexander Aged about 30 years Occ. AE SCCL R/o H. No. 485 Annojiguda Ghatkesar Mandal Medchal Malkajgiri 500088
16. Peram Sri Nikitha, D/o Peram Roshaiiah Aged about 26 years Occ. Unemployed R/o H. No. 28406 Sundhar Nagar Miryalaguda Nalgonda508207
17. Bumbathula Sravan Kumar, S/o Kishan Aged about 25, Occ. Unemployed R/o H .No. 372, Near Grampanchayat Office Vempalli Village Hajipur Mandal Mancherial District Telangana 504209

18. Aloori Rajashekar, S/o A Bhadraiah Aged about 28 years, Occupation. Unemployee R/o H. No. 120, Vitayipally Amangal, Rangareddy 509321
19. P Chandan, S/o P Ravinder Aged about 32 years, Occ. Chief Depot Material Supt SC Railways R/o H No 3535/A/1/B Shanthinagar Sirsilla Karimnagar 505301
20. B Navitha, D/o B Mangilal Aged about 30 years Occ. Sub Inspector of Police R/o H. No. 17161/1F12 Krupadeep Apartments South Kamala nagar ECIL X Roads Hyderabad 500062

(As per C.O dated. 20/12/2024 vide I.A.No.13 of 2024 Respondents 19 and 20 is withdrawn)

21. Badavath Mounika, D/o Badavath Venkanna Aged about 30 years Occ. Unmployee R/o H. No. 4137, Poosala Thanda Edjerla Maripeda, Mahboobabad 506315
22. Pogaku Sravanthi, D/o Ranga Reddy Aged about 29 years, Occ. Government Employee R/o Burgupally, Koilkonda, Mahabubnagar District HT. No. 2311700966, GRL Rank 627 EWS

(Respondent No 21 and Respondent No 22 not necessary parties in this Writ Appeal)

**...RESPONDENTS/RESPNDNETS
IN WP.No.28639 OF 2024**

IA NO: 3 OF 2025

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased suspend the operation of the orders of the Learned Single Judge passed in W.P. No. 28639 of 2024, dated. 20/12/2024 pending disposal of the main Writ Appeal.

Counsel for the Appellant: SRI P.S.RAJASEKHAR, SC FOR TPSC
Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 TO 9: SRI J.SUDHEER
Counsel for the Respondent No.10: Ms. M.SHALINI, GP FOR SERVICES-II
Counsel for the Respondent Nos.11 TO 13: GP FOR SERVICES-I
Counsel for the Respondent Nos.14 TO 18: SRI GODA SIVA, SENIOR
COUNSEL FOR SRI B.ARJUN
Counsel for the Respondent Nos.19 TO 22: --

The Court made the following: COMMON JUDGMENT

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.M.MOHIUDDIN

WRIT APPEAL Nos.18, 74, 106 and 167 of 2025

Dated: 31.12.2025

WRIT APPEAL No.18 of 2025

Between:

Bumbathula Sravan Kumar

...Petitioner

and

Telangana Public Service Commission, rep. by its Secretary, Prathibha
Bhavan, M.J.Road, Nampally, Hyderabad – 500 001 and 17 others

...Respondents

WRIT APPEAL No.74 of 2025

Between:

Pogaku Sravanthi

...Petitioner

and

Telangana Public Service Commission, rep. by its Secretary, Prathibha
Bhavan, M.J.Road, Nampally, Hyderabad – 500 001 and 21 others

...Respondents

WRIT APPEAL No.106 of 2025

Between:

Sindhu Tejovath

...Petitioner

and

Telangana Public Service Commission, rep. by its Secretary, Prathibha Bhavan, M.J.Road, Nampally, Hyderabad and 13 others

...Respondents

WRIT APPEAL No.167 of 2025

Between:

Telangana Public Service Commission(TGPSC),
rep. by its Secretary

...Petitioner

and

Khethavath Roja, D/o K Lalu Naik,
Aged 29 years, Occ: Senior Section Engineer in
Southern Railways, R/o H.No.4-62, Rallavaguthanda,
Damaracharla Mandal, Kondraprol, Nalgonda – 508355, and 21 others

...Respondents

COMMON JUDGMENT (Aparesh Kumar Singh, CJ):

Mr. Goda Siva, learned Senior Counsel represents Mr. B.Arjun,
learned counsel for appellants in W.A.No.18 of 2025.

Mr. G.Vidya Sagar, learned Senior Counsel represents Mr. Sai
Prasen Gundavaram, learned counsel for appellant in W.A.No.74 of
2025 and respondent No.14 in W.A.No.106 of 2025.

Mr. T.Surya Karan Reddy, learned Senior Counsel represents Mr. Gouraram Rajashekar Reddy, learned counsel for appellant in W.A.No.106 of 2025.

Mr. P.S.Rajasekhar, learned Standing Counsel for Telangana Public Service Commission appears for appellant in W.A.No.167 of 2025 and respondent No.1 in W.A.Nos.18, 74 and 106 of 2025.

Mr. J.Sudheer, learned counsel appears for respondent Nos.6 to 14 in W.A.Nos.18 and 74 of 2025; respondent Nos.1 to 9 in W.A.No.167 of 2025.

Mr. U.Santosh Kumar, learned counsel appears for respondent No.11 in W.A.No.106 of 2025.

Ms. M.Shalini, learned Government Pleader for Services-II appears for respondent No.2 in W.A.Nos.18, 74 and 106 of 2025 and respondent No.10 in W.A.No.167 of 2025.

2. All the writ appeals are directed against the order dated 20.12.2024 in W.P.No.28639 of 2024 passed by the learned writ court. Therefore, all the writ appeals are heard together and are being disposed of by this common judgment.

3. (i) Writ appeal No.18 of 2025 was filed by the respondent Nos.12, 13, 6, 8 and 10 in the writ petition No.28639 of 2024.

(ii) Writ appeal No.74 of 2025 was filed by the respondent No.14 in the writ petition No.28639 of 2024.

(iii) Writ appeal No.106 of 2025 was filed by the petitioner No.6 in the writ petition No.28639 of 2024.

(iv) Writ appeal No.167 of 2025 was filed by the Telangana Public Service Commission/respondent No.1 in the writ petition No.28639 of 2024.

4. The parties are referred as per their status in the writ petition.

5. In response to the Notification No.31/2022, dated 31.12.2022 issued by the Telangana Public Service Commission (hereinafter referred to as 'the Commission') for the post of Assistant Motor Vehicle Inspector (AMVI), the writ petitioners have submitted their applications. The petitioners appeared for the written examination on 28.06.2023. The petitioners appeared for document verification in response to the notice dated 30.05.2024. In response to the notice dated 28.06.2024, the petitioners attended the medical examination scheduled from 01.07.2024 to 08.07.2024. The petitioner Nos.1 to 5 and 8 appeared on 01.07.2024, petitioner No.6 appeared on 03.07.2024 and petitioner Nos.7 and 9 appeared on 06.07.2024 for medical examination.

6. It is the case of the petitioners that on the first day i.e., 01.07.2024, the medical examination was held in a very casual manner at Osmania General Hospital and the same was protested by some of the candidates, including the petitioner Nos.1, 3, 4, 5 and 8 and they sent mails to the Commission on 01.07.2024, 02.07.2024, 03.07.2024 and 06.07.2024 objecting the manner in which the medical examination was conducted. Subsequently, some changes have been made in taking physical measurements. However, on the first day, no such procedure was adopted. On 10.10.2024, the Commission has published the provisional selection list, wherein the petitioners were not selected. It is stated that the petitioner No.7, who is working as the Transport Constable in Transport Department, which also requires the same physical measurements as that of AMVI. Similar is the case of the petitioner No.9, who is working as Forest Section Officer in Forest Department, which also require the same physical measurements. Thus, it is clear that the respondents have adopted illegal methods to disqualify the meritorious candidates like the petitioners. It is also the case of the writ petitioners that on the first day of medical examination, i.e., 01.07.2024, 50 candidates were asked to attend. Among those 50 candidates, 10 are female. Among those 10 female candidates, 6 of them are meritorious as per their marks in the written test, who could come

with 1:1 ratio. However, out of those 6 female candidates, only one candidate was finally shown as fit and the remaining five meritorious female candidates, including petitioner Nos.1, 3 and 5 were shown unfit. Further, as per para 4 of G.O.Ms.No.147, the chest measurements shall be taken twice. But in the present case, the said procedure was not followed. As per the said G.O., the Board has to take the physical measurements, whereas in the present case, one single individual has undertaken the procedure. Therefore, the petitioners have filed the writ petition with the following prayer:

“... to call for the records pertaining to notification No.31/2022 dated 31.12.2022 issued for filling up the post of AMVI and declare the conduct of medical examination as unfair, unequal, uneven without standardized procedure that too by random persons without expertise, discriminatory and unconstitutional besides being violative of the procedure stated under G.O.Ms.No.147 and consequently direct the 1st respondent to undertake the re-medical by an independent agency/medical board and accordingly undertake the selection process only thereafter and to consider the candidature of the petitioners based on the re-medical examination coupled with their merit by issuance of Writ, Order or Direction, more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus and pass such other order or orders as this Hon’ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case”.

7. The learned writ court framed two issues, which are extracted for the ready reference:

“1) Whether the medical examination conducted by respondent No.5 was undertaken in a legal manner or on the basis of arbitrary procedure?

2) Whether the re-medical examination sought for by the petitioners is permissible under the law?”

8. The learned writ court observed that petitioner Nos.1, 3, 4, 5 and 8, who underwent medical examination on the first day of the schedule i.e., 01.07.2024, have sent e-mails to the Commission on 01.07.2024, 02.07.2024, 03.07.2024 and 06.07.2024 complaining the irregularities while conducting medical examination i.e., during chest measurements stating that they took measurement without giving sufficient time for proper inhalation and exhalation. Further, the women candidates have also raised objections before the Commission and also respondent No.5/Board members complaining that chest expansion for women was conducted in highly arbitrary manner. The writ court further observed that the counter affidavit filed by the Commission is silent on these allegations.

9. The learned writ court further noted that the petitioner Nos.7 and 9 are working as Government servants and the selection for the posts held by them also requires the very same physical standards, which are prescribed for the recruitment to the post of AMVIs and that the petitioner Nos.7 and 9 qualified in the medical examinations conducted in the years 2017 and 2019. The learned writ court expressed as to how they were disqualified in the medical examination conducted for the post of AMVIs in the present recruitment notification. The counter affidavits filed by the Commission and also the Board are silent on this aspect. In

view of the aforesaid fact situation, the learned writ court came to the conclusion that the medical examination was not conducted in a proper manner in respect of petitioner Nos.1 to 5, 7, 8 and 9 and as such directed the respondents to undertake the exercise of re-medical examination in respect of the petitioner Nos.1 to 5, 7, 8 and 9 and consider their candidature for selection to the posts of AMVI as per the outcome of the re-medical examination. However, insofar as the petitioner No.6 is concerned, who underwent medical examination on 03.07.2024, since she has not raised any objection/grievance before the Commission at the initial stage, the relief was not granted to her. The writ petition was allowed in part to the said extent. The writ court further directed the Government of Telangana to take steps for framing necessary norms in this regard.

10. Aggrieved by the said order of the learned writ court, respondent Nos. 12, 13, 6, 8 and 10 have filed W.A.No.18 of 2025; respondent No.14 has filed W.A.No.74 of 2025; petitioner No.6 has filed W.A.No.106 of 2025 and the Commission has filed W.A.No.167 of 2025.

11. Mr. P.S.Rajasekhar, learned Standing Counsel for the Telangana Public Service Commission has submitted that in Notification

No.31/2002, dated 31.12.2022 issued for the post of Assistant Motor Vehicles Inspector in Transport Department, it is specifically mentioned in clause (ii) of Note below the Physical Requirements column that *“request for re-medical examination will not be entertained”*. If the re-medical examination is permitted after long lapse of time of four months, the candidates might have gone to the Gym and there is every likely chance of expanding their chest. Therefore, re-medical examination is not at all permissible under any circumstances. Further, the petitioners have approached the court after publication of the selection list and after coming to know that they have not been selected. He has further pointed out that the G.O.Ms.No.147, dated 06.08.2016, which has been relied upon by the writ petitioners is of the State of Andhra Pradesh and is not applicable to the State of Telangana. Learned counsel has referred to the judgment of a Division Bench of this Court in **Pannala Praveen vs. State of Andhra Pradesh**¹, wherein the Division Bench has categorically held that the constitution of the second Medical Board was arbitrary and contrary to law. He has further pointed out that the learned writ court erred in observing in para 16 of its judgment that the judgements relied by the learned counsel for the respondents are not applicable to the facts of the present case, even without referring to the

¹ 2017 (3) ALT 728 (DB)

facts of each case. Therefore, the direction of the learned writ court to the respondents to undertake exercise of re-medical examination of petitioner Nos.1 to 5, 7, 8 and 9 is not proper. Therefore, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

12. Mr. G.Vidya Sagar, learned Senior Counsel for the appellant in W.A.No.74 of 2025 has submitted that the observation of the learned writ court that the Government of Telangana is required to take steps for framing necessary norms, like the G.O.Ms.No.147, dated 06.08.2018, issued by the Government of Andhra Pradesh, which enumerates the Regulations relating to the physical examination of candidates, is for future recruitments only and not for the present recruitment. That cannot be a guiding factor for allowing the writ petition.

13. Mr. Goda Siva, learned Senior Counsel for the appellants in W.A.No.18 of 2025 has submitted that when the writ petition was filed, the selection list was already published. The names of the appellants in W.A.No.18 of 2025 were found, but the writ petitioners have not assailed the selection list in the writ petition. The learned writ court has not dealt with the issue of what would happen for the candidates who have been selected, nor is it prayed for in the writ petition. He has further submitted that the allegation in the e-mails sent by the petitioners

to the Commission is that the doctors who have come from the Osmania General Hospital did not note the chest measurements properly. After sending the e-mail and till the publication of the selection list, they writ petitioners did not pursue their representation for four months and virtually they have allowed the things to move further. The writ petitioners have not alleged any malice against the doctors who have conducted medical examination. The writ petition is filed only as a tool projecting an illegality which, at the relevant point of time the petitioners did not think about it as illegal. The learned writ court has relied on a judgment, which has been overruled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, though the same has been brought to the notice of the learned Single Judge. Further, the learned writ court committed error in para 16 of its judgment holding that the judgments relied by the learned counsel for the respondents are not applicable to the facts of the case in view of discrepancies pointed out in issue No.1, even without referring to the facts of the cases relied on by the respondents. He has further pointed out that there is a specific embargo in the notification that there is no re-medical examination. Therefore, the order of the learned writ court is liable to be set aside.

14. Mr. T.Surya Karan Reddy, learned Senior Counsel for the appellant in W.A.No.106 of 2025 submits that the learned writ court

committed error in not granting relief to the appellant/petitioner No.6 on the ground that petitioner No.6, who underwent physical examination on 03.07.2024, has not raised any objection/grievance before the Commission. He has further submitted that the counter affidavit filed by the Commission states that the appellant/petitioner No.6's chest measurement on full inspiration was 68 cms, whereas it must not be less than 79.80 cms on full inspiration in respect of the candidates belonging to the Scheduled Tribe Women as per the recruitment notification. Therefore, the appellant/petitioner No.6 was disqualified. The learned Senior Counsel has stated that the medical certificate, which is annexed to the writ appeal at pg.66, issued by the Government General Hospital, Suryapet on 04.07.2024 clearly shows that the appellant/petitioner No.6's chest measurement on full inspiration was 86 cms. Even after counter affidavit filed on 13.11.2024, the appellant/petitioner No.6 got checked her physical measurements by one Dr.V.Srinivas, Civil Surgeon (Specialist), Yadadri Bhongiri District. As per the medical certificate, dated 16.11.2024 (annexed at pg.67), the chest measurement on full inspiration was 86 cms. Therefore, a direction may be issued for re-medical examination of the appellant/petitioner No.6.

15. Mr. U.Santosh Kumar, learned counsel for respondent No.11 in W.A.No.106 of 2025 has submitted that the name of respondent No.11

is in the selection list, who is next to the rank of the appellant/petitioner No.6. He has further submitted that per the notification, re-medical examination is not permitted and therefore, the appellant in the aforesaid appeal cannot be allowed to be sent to re-medical examination.

16. Mr. J.Sudheer, learned counsel for the writ petitioners/respondent Nos.6 to 14 in W.A.Nos.18 and 74 of 2025 and respondent Nos.1 to 9 in W.A.No.167 of 2025 has submitted that the note (ii) below the physical requirements of the notification dated 31.12.2022 stating that '*request for re-medical examination will not be entertained*' is a misconception derived from the judgment of the **Pannala Praveen** (supra). In **Pannala Praveen** (supra), the Public Service Commission was undertaking the exercise of medical examination. The Government had constituted the second medical board in view of the objections raised by the unsuccessful candidates. In that peculiar fact situation, the proposition is laid down that constitution of the second Medical Board was contrary to law. That proposition is not applicable to the other recruitments. Therefore, the clause that re-medical examination will not be entertained does not have any relevance. He has argued that the petitioners have raised objections by sending e-mails immediately to the Commission regarding the conduct of the medical examination in a casual manner. As there was no response to the e-mails, they waited under the hope that the

Commission may rectify. If there is any rejection order or any communication to the grievance raised by the petitioners in their e-mails, they would have challenged the same immediately. It is not the case that the petitioners have not raised objections at the beginning and now that the petitioners have raised objections by filing the writ petitions after publication of the selection list. Further, the stand of the Commission in the counter affidavit that it has nothing to do with the medical examination as it has been entrusted to the Medical Board, cannot be accepted.

17. Learned Senior Counsel has further pointed out that in the counter affidavit filed by the Commission in para 17 (pg.320 of the counter affidavit), it has been stated that the Commission is a formal party in the matter. He has pointed out that it is the bounden duty of the Commission to select meritorious candidates. It cannot escape its responsibility by simply stating that it is a formal party. Further, as per the table of list of petitioners – reasons for rejection, at pg. 316 of the counter affidavit, there is very very marginal difference in the measurements by which the petitioners are disqualified. He has further submitted that the petitioners cannot challenge the appointments of the selected candidates because they are only in the select list. Once the re-medical examination is conducted and if they qualify in the medical

examination, they may get appointments. There is no procedure contemplated for the medical examination like G.O.Ms.No.147 applicable in the State of Andhra Pradesh. Surprisingly, the Commission has referred to the G.O.Ms.No.31, dated 01.11.2019 which is applicable to the physically handicapped candidates. He has further pointed out that rejecting the cases of the petitioners on the ground of disqualification in the medical examination is nothing but violation of principles of natural justice as the petitioners were not given any notice or any response to their e-mails especially when they had raised objections that medical examination is not conducted in a proper manner. He has supported the judgment of the learned writ court and sought dismissal of the writ appeals.

18. We have considered the submissions of learned counsel for the parties, perused the impugned order and also the relevant materials placed on the record.

19. By the impugned judgment, the Commission has been directed to undertake the exercise of re-medical examination of petitioner Nos.1 to 5, 7 to 9 and consider their candidature for selection to the post of AMVI under recruitment notification No.31/2022, dated 31.12.2022. The Commission and other respondents, whose names appeared in the

select list, have preferred these appeals being aggrieved. Apart from that petitioner No.6 in the writ petition who was denied relief on the ground that she had not raised any objection before the Commission at the initial stage has also preferred the appeal, i.e., W.A.No.106 of 2025. The learned writ court also recommended the Government of Telangana to frame necessary norms dealing with physical examination of candidates and grievance redressal mechanism taking into account the procedure prescribed under G.O.Ms.No.147, dated 06.08.2016 issued by the Government of Andhra Pradesh. The entire issue in this batch of appeals revolves around the medical examination exercise of the writ petitioners who appeared in the recruitment examination. The notification prescribed the following physical requirements for appointment by direct recruitment.

“PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS:- “The candidate for appointment by direct recruitment shall satisfy the following physical requirements:

- (a) In respect of male candidates, the minimum height must not be less than 165 cms and must not be less than 86.3 cms round the chest on full inspiration with a minimum expansion of 5.00 cms;
- (b) In case of women candidates, the height shall not be less than 157.5 cms, and must not be less than 82.30 cms round the chest on full inspiration with a minimum of expansion of 5.00 cms;
- (c) In case of male candidates belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes communities and aboriginal tribes, the minimum height must not be less than 160 cms and must not be less than 83.80 cms round the chest on full inspiration with a minimum expansion of 5.00 cms

(d) In case of female candidates belonging to the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes communities and aboriginal tribes, the minimum height must not be less than 52.5 cms and must not be less than 79.80 cms round the chest on full inspiration with a minimum expansion of 5.00 cms;

(e) Must be certified to possess the visual standards specified below without glasses:

- (i) Right eye : Distance Vision 6/6
Near Vision 0.5 (on Snellen's Chart)
- (ii) Left eye : Distance Vision 6/6
Near Vision 0.5 (on Snellen's Chart)

(iii) Each eye must have a full field of vision

(iv) Colour Blindness, Squint or any morbid conditions of the eyes or lids of either eye, knock knees, pigeon chest, flat foot, varicose veins, hammer toes, fractured limbs and decayed teeth shall be deemed to be a disqualification.

Note:-

i) The applicants should satisfy a competent Medical Board as to their fitness, Physical Requirements, Vision etc., as provided for in the Rules at the appropriate stage of the recruitment process.

ii) Request for Re-medical examination will not be entertained.”

20. The medical examination of the writ petitioners were undertaken between 01.07.2024 and 08.07.2024. The written examination was held for 113 such posts on 28.06.2024. Petitioner Nos.1, 3, 4, 5 and 8 sent e-mails to the Commission on 01.07.2024, 02.07.2024, 03.07.2024 and 06.07.2024 objecting the manner in which the medical examination was conducted. However, the writ petitions were filed on 15.10.2025 only after the final list was published on 10.10.2024. The delay in approaching the writ court is one of the grounds raised by the

Commission and successful candidates both before the writ court and in the present appeals. According to them, if re-medical examination is carried out pursuant to the impugned order dated 20.12.2024 after six months of the medical examination of the writ petitioners, it would not reflect the physical measurements of the candidate as reflected in the medical examination conducted between 01.07.2024 and 08.07.2024 because of passage of time and there is every likelihood of the candidates improving their physical measurements especially of chest.

21. During the course of submissions, this Court directed the Commission to produce the records of the physical measurements of the writ petitioners. They were produced on 10.12.2025 in a sealed cover and perused by this Court. The physical measurements of the writ petitioners were also furnished in the form of a tabular chart with reasons for rejection at paragraph 11 of the counter affidavit of the Commission. The physical measurements contained in the tabular chart tally with the medical records produced by the Commission during the course of hearing. They are extracted hereunder for better appreciation:

List of petitioners - Reasons for rejection

S. No.	Hall Ticket No.	Candidate Name	Gender	Community	Reasons for rejection	Physical fitness Measurement as per the notification
1.	2311700547	KHETHAVATH ROJA	F	ST	The candidate's Chest expansion difference below 5cm's i.e., 4Cms	Chest Expansion difference for ST women community – 5 Cms
2.	2311700170	AREDLA	M	OC	As per visual standards	Right eye:

		MAHIDHAR REDDY			reports, the candidate is not eligible candidate (having Visual standards Right Eye: 6/9 & Left Eye : 6/9)	Distance Vision 6/6 Near Vision 0.5 (on Snellen's Chart) Left eye: Distance vision 6/6 Near Vision 0.5 (on Snellen's Chart)
3.	2311700362	K. SRINIDHI	F	OC	The candidate's Chest Expansion difference below 5cm's i.e., 4Cms	Chest Expansion difference for OC community women – 5 Cms
4.	2311700427	MITTAPALLY SRINIVAS	M	SC	The candidate's Chest Expansion difference below 5cm's i.e., 3Cms	Chest Expansion difference for SC community Men – 5 Cms
5.	2311700292	THARIJESSICA FLOURANCE	F	SC	The candidate's Chest Expansion difference below 5cm's i.e., 4Cms	Chest Expansion difference for SC community women – 5 Cms
6 ² .	2311802059	BILLAM TEJA RAO	M	BC-C	The candidate's Height less than 165 Cms, i.e., 164.2 Cms	Height Measurement for BC-C Men candidates is 165
7.	2311701757	SINDHU TEJOVATH	F	ST	The candidate's Chest Measurement – full inspiration less than 79.80 Cms i.e., 68 Cms	Chest Measurement – full inspiration for ST – women candidates – 79.80 Cms
8.	2311700445	BAVANDLA SAIKUMAR	M	BC-B	The candidate's Chest Expansion difference below 5 cm's, i.e., 4Cms	Chest Expansion difference for BC community – 5Cms
9.	2311802661	THALLAPALLY SRAVYA	F	BC-B	The candidate's Height less than 157.5 Cms, i.e., 157 Cms	Height Measurement for BC-B Women candidates 157.5

22. Two of these candidates, namely petitioner No.2 and petitioner No.9 failed on the ground of eyesight and height respectively. The recruitment notification clearly stated that the request for re-medical examination will not be entertained. The petitioners claimed to have approached the Government Doctors for their physical measurements. According to them, their physical measurement reports found them fulfilling the physical requirements of the recruitment notification. The

² Details of petitioner No.6 is given as petitioner No.7 and the details of petitioner No.7 is given as petitioner No.6 in the counter affidavit. The extract is as per the counter affidavit submitted by the Public Service Commission

petitioners have raised their grievances by way of e-mails to the Commission and the details are as under:

TABLE SHOWING THE DETAILS OF THE PETITIONERS AND E-MAILS SENT

Petitioner No.	Name	Medical exam conducted	e-mail sent on	Discrepancy complained	Got medical certificate by personal consultation on
1	Khethavath Roja	01.07.2024	10.07.2024 (referred e-mail of 01.07.2024)	Chest measurements	04.07.2024
2	Aredla Mahidhar Reddy	-	-	-	08.07.2024
3	K Srinidhi	01.07.2024	02.07.2024 (on behalf of women candidates also)	Chest measurements	
4	Mittapally Srinivas	01.07.2024	02.07.2024 06.07.2024	Chest measurements	02.07.2024
5	Thari Jessica Flourance	01.07.2024	02.07.2024 (on behalf of women candidates also)	Chest measurements	
6	Sindhu Tejovath	03.07.2024	-	-	04.07.2024
7	Billam Teja Rao	06.07.2024	-	-	
8	Bavandla Saikumar	01.07.2024	03.07.2024	Chest measurements	02.07.2024
9	Sravya Thallapally	06.07.2024	-	-	14.10.2024

23. It is therefore important to examine the records of the physical measurements by this Court, more so since the learned writ court had not ventured to ask for the reports. The format of the medical reports is as under:

TELANGANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION :: HYDERABAD

ASSISTANT MOTOR VEHICLES INSPECTOR IN TRANSPORT
DEPARTMENT

(GENERAL RECRUITMENT)

NOTIFICATION No.31/2022, DATED: 31/12/2022

Regd. No.:

Date of Verification:

Name of the Candidate :

Signature of the Candidate :

CERTIFICATION OF PHYSICAL FITNESS

I have examined (full name) Sri / Smt / Kum
 _____ S/o, D/o, W/o
 _____ a
 candidate to the post of Assistant Motor Vehicle Inspector in Telangana
 Transport Department and I am not able to discover that he/she has any disease,
 constitutional affection or bodily infirmity except that
 _____ (disease). I do not consider this as disqualification
 for the employment he/she seeks.

I further certify that in my opinion his/her general physical condition is such
 as to enable him to perform efficiently the active duties of Executives Service.

1. HEIGHT- _____ Cms.

2. CHEST MEASUREMENT

(A) On full inspiration _____ Cms.

(B) On full expiration _____ Cms.

(C) Difference (Expansion) _____ Cms.

3. Indicate YES or NO against each of the following items.

I) Knock knees	YES/NO
II) Pigeon Chest	YES/NO
III) Flat Foot	YES/NO
IV) Varicose Veins	YES/NO
V) Hammer toes	YES/NO
VI) Fractured limbs	YES/NO
VII) Decayed teeth	YES/NO

Signature of the Medical Officer-1 Signature of the Medical Officer-2 Signature of the Medical
 Officer-3

Name

Name:

Name:

Designation:

Designation:

Designation:

TELANGANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION :: HYDERABAD

ASSISTANT MOTOR VEHICLES INSPECTOR IN TRANSPORT
DEPARTMENT

(GENERAL RECRUITMENT)

NOTIFICATION No.31/2022, DATED: 31/12/2022

Regd. No.:

Date of Verification:

Name of the Candidate :

Signature of the Candidate :

CERTIFICATE OF EYE VISION

(To be certified by an Ophthalmologist not below the rank of Civil Assistant Surgeon)

I do hereby certify that I have examined (full name) Sri/Smt/ Kum _____ S/o, D/o, W/o _____ a candidate for the post of Assistant Motor Vehicle Inspector in Telangana Transport Department and certify that he possesses the following visual standards specified below without glasses.

I) Right Eye: Distant Vision _____
(Without Glasses) Near Vision _____

II) Left Eye: Distant Vision _____
(Without Glasses) Near Vision _____

III) Whether each eye has full field of vision without glasses YES/NO

IV) Colour Blindness YES/NO

V) Squint or any morbid conditions of the eyes or lids of either eye
YES/NO

VI) AS PER VISUAL STANDARDS WHETHER THE CANDIDATE IS
ELIGIBLE YES/NO

VII) Remarks If Any :-

Signature of the Medical Officer

Station:

Name:

Date:

Designation:

24. The format of Certificate of Vision requires signature of Medical Officer or Professor of Ophthalmology of the Osmania General Hospital and also the signature of the candidate. Similarly, the Certificate of Physical Fitness requires certification by the Board, which comprised Professor and Head of the Department cum Civil Surgeon, Department of Orthopaedic; Civil Surgeon cum Professor of Medicine and Professor and Head of the Department of General Surgery of Osmania General Hospital.

25. The Certificate of Physical Fitness was issued by the Board of three Medical Officers comprising Professor and Head of the Department cum Civil Surgeon, Department of Orthopaedic; Civil Surgeon cum Professor of Medicine and Professor and Head of the Department of General Surgery of Osmania General Hospital. All of them have inscribed their signatures on the certificate. More importantly, for purposes of appreciating the controversy at hand, it is pertinent to take note that the signature of the candidate is also required to be inscribed at the time of physical measurement. All the petitioners inscribed their signature both on the Certificate of Eye Vision and the Certificate of Physical Fitness. None of them inscribed their signatures under protest raising any grievance as to recording of their physical measurement of chest or height or relates to defective eye vision. The

petitioners did not plead *mala fide* against any of the doctors of the Medical Board, regarding their physical measurement or against the professor of Ophthalmology of the Osmania General Hospital regarding the certificate of eye vision. There is no reason to suspect any deliberate act of *mala fide* to declare these candidates unfit on parameters of physical measurement or eye sight prescribed under the recruitment notification. If the physical measurements of the petitioners or eye sight recorded in the presence revealed such deliberate act of recording incorrect measurements and if the candidates got their physical measurement or eye sight examined by the Government Doctors in close proximity of the dates of their medical examination, they should have approached the learned writ court immediately thereafter instead of waiting for the publication of the final list on 10.10.2024 more than three months after their medical examination. This was all the more expected since the recruitment notification clearly indicated that no request for re-medical examination would be entertained. It is in these circumstances, the Commission rightly objected that the physical measurements of chest would vary as the candidate could have undertaken physical exercise to improve their physical measurements. The learned writ court, while passing the impugned judgment, failed to take into account that any exercise of re-medical examination after 5-6

months would not be proper as the physical measurements especially of the chest of the petitioners could have undergone substantial change or improvement compared to the measurements recorded during medical examination between 01.07.2024 and 08.07.2024 at Osmania General Hospital.

26. As such, learned writ court was not justified in directing the Commission to undertake re-medical examination of petitioner Nos.1 to 5 and 7 to 9 for consideration of their candidature for the purpose of AMVIs. The petitioner No.7, Billam Teja Rao, who was BC-C category candidate, was found unfit in height as the minimum height requirement was 165 cms, whereas he was found to be 164.2 cms. The petitioner No.2, Aredla Mahidhar Reddy was found to be suffering from defect of vision as his right eye and left eye both were found to have 6/9 vision compared to the normal vision of 6/6. The petitioner No.9, Sravya Thalapally, a female candidate of BC-B category was found to have medically unfit in height. Rest of the petitioners were unfit as their expansion of full inspiration is less than 5 cms.

27. Learned writ court was persuaded by the statements of petitioner No.7, Billam Teja Rao, and petitioner No.9, Sravya Thallapally, that they fulfilled the physical standards in the years 2017 and 2019 at the

time of their appointment as Transport Constable and Forest Section Officer respectively. The medical examination for the present recruitment was conducted in July, 2024 after 7 years and 5 years respectively, therefore, such comparison was not proper. Moreover, the measurement of height in the case of petitioner No.9 by a team of three professors of the Osmania General Hospital could not be doubted on that score. Petitioner No.9, if had genuine reasons to question the physical measurement of height by the team of three professor rank doctors of Osmania General Hospital, she ought to have raised her grievance at the earliest point of time instead of waiting for the publication of final list after more than three months. The Certificate of Physical Fitness brought on record in support of her height is dated 14.10.2024 issued by a Civil Assistant Surgeon of the Osmania General Hospital. The same cannot be made a basis to suspect the Certificate of Physical Fitness, dated 06.07.2024, by the team of three professor rank doctors of the Osmania General Hospital. The conduct of the petitioners after having participated in the medical examination and waited till the publication of final list more than three months and thereafter turn around to question the method of selection, is not permissible. The learned writ court failed to take into account that G.O.Ms.No.147 dated 06.08.2016 issued by the Government of Andhra Pradesh does not have any application to the

facts of the present case. The learned writ court was also not right in ignoring the proposition of law laid down by learned Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Pannala Praveen** (supra). The learned Court had deprecated the constitution of the second medical board when the exercise undertaken by the Commission. Apart from the above, the learned writ court also failed to take into consideration that despite publication of the final list, the petitioners had failed to assail the appointment of the successful candidates, though several other successful candidates in the merit list were likely to be affected if the relief prayed for by them was allowed.

28. Coming to the case of the appellant in W.A.No.106 of 2025, her chest measurement on full inspiration was 68 cms, less than 79.80 cms prescribed on full inspiration for candidates belonging to the ST women category. If petitioner No.6 had any grievance thereto and had got her chest measurements taken at a Government General Hospital on 04.07.2024 showing chest measurement on full inspiration as 86 cms, neither did she approach the writ court immediately nor made any complaint like the other petitioners to the Commission. The measurements of chest would vary depending upon the fitness or health of a person. Therefore, the contention of the petitioner No.6/appellant in W.A.No.106 of 2025 that her chest measurement was commensurate to

the requirements under the instant recruitment exercise, since her chest measurements in school was also of that standard is difficult to accept. We, therefore, do not find any reason to take a different view as respects the petitioner No.6/appellant in W.A.No.106 of 2025 for the reasons recorded hereinabove.

30. In the result, the impugned order dated 20.12.2024 passed in W.P.No.28639 of 2024 is set aside so far the learned writ court had directed the respondents to undertake the exercise of re-medical examination in respect of petitioner Nos.1 to 5 and 7 to 9 and to consider their candidature for selection to the post of AMVI as per the outcome of the re-medical examination. Writ appeal Nos.18, 74 and 167 of 2025 are allowed. Writ appeal No.106 of 2025 filed by the petitioner No.6 is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

SD/-K. SRINIVASA RAO
JOINT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To

1. The Secretary, Telangana Public Service Commission, Prathibha Bhavan, M J Road, Nampally, Hyderabad - 500001
2. The Principal Secretary to Government General Administration Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad, State of Telangana.
3. The Principal Secretary to Government Transport Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad, State of Telangana.
4. Commissioner of Transport Department, Khairtabad, Hyderabad.
5. The Superintendent, Osmania General Hospital, Afzal Gunj, Hyderabad
6. One CC to SRI B.ARJUN, Advocate [OPUC]
7. One CC to SRI MOHD BASEER RIYAZ, Advocate [OPUC]

Cmtd...

8. One CC to SRI GOURARAM RAJASHEKAR REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
9. One CC to SRI P.S. RAJASEKHAR, SC FOR TGPSC [OPUC]
10. One CC to SRI SAI PRASEN GUNDAVARAM, Advocate [OPUC]
11. One CC to SRI GOURARAM RAJASHEKAR REDDY, Advocate [OPUC]
12. One CC to SRI J. SUDHEER, Advocate [OPUC]
13. One CC to SRI U. SANTOSH KUMAR, Advocate [OPUC]
14. Two CCs to GP FOR SERVICES-II, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad. [OUT]
15. Two CCs to GP FOR TRANSPORT, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad. [OUT]
16. Two CCs to GP FOR MEDICAL HEALTH & FW, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad. [OUT]
17. Two CD Copies

PSK.

BS


Jks

HIGH COURT

DATED:31/12/2025

COMMON JUDGMENT

WA.Nos.18, 74, 106 AND 167 of 2025



**ALLOWING THE W.A.Nos.18, 74 AND 167 OF 2025
AND DISMISSING THE W.A.No.106 OF 2025
WITHOUT COSTS**

(22) - JKS
27/2/26