APHC010548612026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3460]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE 13th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

WRIT PETITION NO: 29982/2026

Between:

J Manjula **...PETITIONER**

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others **...RESPONDENT(S)**

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. CH SRINIVAS

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR SERVICES III

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

W.P.No.29982 of 2026

O R DE R:

The present writ petition is filed questioning the action of the Respondent Authorities in issuing the proceedings in Rc.No.K8/129/2024, dated 15.07.2026 keeping the Petitioner temporarily out of employment as Field Assistant arbitrary and illegal.

2. The facts leading to the filing of the case are as follows:

The Petitioner was working as Field Assistant since 2019. While so, the Respondent No.3 issued the impugned Proceedings dated 15.07.2026keeping the Petitioner temporarily out of employment as Field Assistant and also issued show cause notice dated 06.05.2026 to submit an explanation. After receipt of notice, the Petitioner had submitted his explanation on 11.05.2026 denying the allegations. Thereafter, the Respondent No.3 issued Orders suspending the service of the Petitioner vide Proceedings dated 15.07.2026 while calling for the explanation of the Petitioner. Thereupon, the Petitioner submitted his explanation on 17.07.2026. It is stated that after submitting the explanation by the Petitioner, no Charge Memo has been issued and no departmental enquiry has been initiated. Hence, the present Writ Petition.

3. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the Petitioner that as the enquiry proceedings were not concluded within the time specified in Clause 13 (B)(5) of the Field Assistants Human Resource Policy i.e. 30 days, the Petitioner is entitled to be reinstated into service. The Counsel also relied on an order passed in similar circumstances by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in W.P.No.16643 of 2025.

4. Learned Standing Counsel submits that the enquiry will be initiated and enquiry would be concluded in compliance of the procedure prescribed. The further contention is that the guidelines are not statutory and even otherwise, no consequence is stated for non-compliance of the time frame of 30 days and therefore, the same cannot be said to be mandatory.

5. Having heard the respective counsel, this Court, without going into the issues urged by the Respondent counsel, is inclined to dispose of the writ petition in terms of W.P.No.16643 of 2025 with a direction to the respondent authorities to reinstate the Petitioner into service. No order as to costs.

As a sequel, pending applications, if any, shall stand closed.

_____

NYAPATHY VIJAY, J

Date: 13.10.2026
eha

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

W.P.No.29982 of 2026

Dt. 13.10.2026

eha