APHC010455222025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI [3543]
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE 6th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE T.C.D.SEKHAR

WRIT PETITION NO: 24203 OF 2025

Between:

1. DANNI ESWARA RAO, S/O. APPALA NAIDU, AGED 31 YEARS, OCC- UNEMPLOYED, R/O. D.NO.8-32-285/A, KOTHA MAJJIPETA V.T.AGRAHARAM, VIZIANAGARAM, VIZIANAGARAM DISTRICT, A.P - 535004.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY, LAW AND LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS, A.P SECRETARIAT AT VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI GUNTUR DISTRICT.
2. HONBLE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI, REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR (RECRUITMENT) HIGH COURT BUILDINGS AT NELAPADU, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT.
3. HONBLE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE, PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE COURT, VIZIANAGARAM DISTRICT, VIZIANAGARAM.
4. THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE COURT, VIZIANAGARAM, VIZIANAGARAM DISTRICT.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. DODDAKA HARSHA VARDHAN

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR SERVICES I
2. A JAYANTHI

The Court made the following ORDER: *(Per NJS,J)*

Pursuant to the Notification No.10/22-RC, dated 21.10.2022 for direct recruitment to the post of 'Office Subordinate' under the Andhra Pradesh Judicial Ministerial and Subordinate Service Rules, 2019, the petitioner applied for the said post. Petitioner was provisionally selected for the said post in Viziangaram Judicial District under Sports Quota. He was directed to report before the Office of 3rd respondent-Principal District Judge, Vizianagaram District, for documents verification. Accordingly, the petitioner submitted the relevant documents. However, as no appointment order was issued to him, he made a representation dated 20.07.2024 and 2nd respondent rejected the same and through communication dated 19.07.2025, called upon the petitioner to collect the original certificates submitted for verification. Under the said circumstances, the present Writ Petition came to be filed.

2) Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia* submitted that the petitioner passed SSC examination compartmentally in the year 2010 and thereafter it took four years to the petitioner to qualify Intermediate, that too compartmentally in the year 2014. Though academically the petitioner is not meritorious, it is submitted that he excelled in sports, particularly Taekwondo and Softball, won medals and certificates. He submits that the petitioner is only meritorious sports person who was provisionally selected for the post of Office Subordinate in Viziangaram Judicial District and action of the respondents in not appointing the

petitioner as Office Subordinate is not just or tenable. Making the said submissions, learned counsel seeks to allow the Writ Petition and grant the reliefs as prayed for.

3) On the other hand Smt.A.Jayanthi, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent Nos.2 to 4 argued the matter with reference to the counters filed on behalf of respondent Nos.2 and 3. She has also drawn the attention of this Court to the relevant Clauses in the Notification dated 21.10.2022 referred to supra. She submits that though the writ petitioner was provisionally selected under meritorious sports person quota, during the verification of documents it was noticed that the petitioner, as stated in the affidavit passed Intermediate examination compartmentally in March, 2014 and therefore he is not eligible for appointment to the post in question. In fact, the petitioner applied for the post of Office Subordinate by suppressing the fact that he is possessing qualification which is more than the prescribed one for the said post. Be that as it may. Rejection of the petitioner's case for appointment is just, valid and in terms of the Notification dated 21.10.2022, that no interference is warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case and therefore, she seeks dismissal of the Writ Petition.

4) Considered the submissions made and perused the material on record. At the outset, it may be appropriate to mention that in the

Notification dated 21.10.2022, the educational qualifications of the applicants are prescribed as follows:

> "**I. EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATIONS:**
> Applicants must have passed 7th Class examination or its equivalent examination. Candidates who failed **"Intermediate or equivalent examination"** will be considered eligible, but those who have higher qualifications than that shall not be considered eligible."

5) General Instructions of the Notification, more particularly, S.Nos.IX(10) and (12) provides as follows:

> "**IX. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:**
> xxx
> **10. The particulars furnished by the applicant in the application form will be taken as final. Candidates should, therefore, be very careful in filling the application.**
> 11. xxx
> **12. If suppression of information/furnishing of false information is noticed, either in the application or in the enclosures, at any stage before the final selection the application of the candidate will be summarily rejected. In addition the candidate will also be liable for appropriate action/prosecution as per Law."**

6) It is not in dispute that the petitioner is provisionally selected for the post of Office Subordinate under meritorious sports person quota. It is also not in dispute that pursuant to the provisional selection, the petitioner in terms of the Notification, is required to produce original certificates on the date mentioned by the High Court for verification. Such verification was also undertaken and as set out in detail in the counter affidavits, it was found that the petitioner passed Intermediate examination in 2014. As noted above, for the post in question the applicant must have passed 7th Class examination or its equivalent examination and the candidates who failed Intermediate or its equivalent examination will be considered eligible, but those who have higher qualifications than that shall not be

considered eligible. The petitioner, who admittedly passed intermediate examination in 2014, though compartmentally, is certainly having higher qualification than prescribed under the Notification in respect of the post of Office Subordinate Post. In such circumstances, as rightly submitted by the learned counsel for the respondents, non-disclosure/ suppression of the material fact i.e., possessing higher qualification as on the date of the Notification itself disentitles the petitioner's claim for appointment, though selected provisionally under meritorious sports person quota. Significantly, the averments made in the counter affidavits are not denied by filing any reply affidavit, which amounts to admission of the specific allegations made in the counter affidavits.

7) Considering the submissions made coupled with the material on record, this Court has no hesitation to hold that the petitioner is not entitled to any reliefs as prayed for.

8) In such view of the matter, the Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

9) Consequently, the Miscellaneous Applications pending, if any, shall also stand dismissed.

NINALA JAYASURYA,J

T.C.D.SEKHAR,J

Date:06.10.2026
Ssv

Whether the order is :
Speaking Yes/No / Reasoned Yes/No
Reportable Yes/No / Non-Reportable Yes/No

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE T.C.D.SEKHAR

WRIT PETITION NO: 24203 OF 2025

Date:06.10.2026

Ssv