APHC010568122026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

Bench Sr.No:-57 [3584]

WRIT PETITION Nos:30938 & 31536 of 2026

W.P.No.30938 OF 2026:

Kakarala Irfan ...Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Andhra Pradesh and Others ...Respondent(s)

****

W.P.No.31536 of 2026:

Mudipalli Snehitha ….Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Andhra Pradesh and others. ….Respondents

****

CORAM : THE CHIEF JUSTICE LISA GILL
SRI JUSTICE CHALLA GUNARANJAN

DATE : 4th November 2026

Present:

Advocate for Petitioner: MR.GHANTA RAMA RAO, Ld. SENIOR COUNSEL, FOR MR.PONNEKANTI MALLIKARJUNA RAO (WP No.30938 of 2026); MR.POSANI VENKATESWARLU, Ld.SENIOR COUNSEL FOR MR.P.SAI SURYA TEJA (WP NO.31536 OF 2026).

Advocate(s) for Respondent(s): GP FOR MEDICAL HEALTH FW, MRS.TATA VENKATA SRIDEVI, STANDING COUNSEL FOR DR.NTR UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES; AND MR. G SAI NARAYANA RAO SC For SAAP, MR.VIVEK CHANDRA SEKHAR S. STANDING COUNSEL FOR NMC.

***

COMMON ORDER: (per Hon'ble Sri Justice Challa Gunaranjan)

Issues raised in both these writ petitions, since are inter-connected and concerned with admissions to MBBS course under sports and games quota, with the consent of learned counsel appearing for parties, the same are taken up for consideration and disposed by common order.

2. **(a)** Mr. K. Irfan, petitioner in W.P. No. 30938 of 2026, secured 410 marks in NEET UG - 2026. He applied for medical admission under sports quota in the stream of fencing game based on his participation in Inter-District Championship for Senior Level in individual category and Inter-District Junior Championship in team category, by furnishing Form II and Form IV certificates. It is stated that 2nd respondent-University also verified these certificates confirming petitioner's participation in the above events. However, petitioner was assigned tentative priority of 189 by merely considering Inter-District Under-19 tournament and ignoring State-level participation on the ground that Form 4 original was not submitted. He, however, later submitted both Form II and Form IV original certificates and requested to reassign priority of 181. In the revised final merit list, dated 16.10.2026, yet again, petitioner's priority was shown as 189, rather 181, which deprived him of securing admission.

(b) It is stated that in case petitioner had been given proper priority of 181, on account of higher marks secured, he would have better merit compared to Ms.M.Snehitha, 4th respondent, who merely secured 291

marks. Therefore, assailing revised final merit list and the purported action of granting admission in favour of Ms.M.Snehitha, 4th respondent, present writ petition has been filed.

3. (a) Ms. M.Snehitha, 4th respondent in above writ petition, independently filed W.P. No.31536 of 2026, being aggrieved by action of respondents in not considering her participation certificate in National School Games along with supporting State-level backup sports certificates and awarding appropriate priority of 151 instead of priority of 181, to be illegal, arbitrary, and contrary to G.O.Ms.No.10, Youth Advancement, Tourism and Culture (Sports) Department, dated 15.07.2008.

(b) Ms.M.Snehitha, petitioner in W.P.No.31536 of 2026, secured 291 marks and sought admission under sports quota in the stream of Archery. She is stated to have participated in 67th National School Games held in 2023, representing the State, and in support, certificate of participation issued in Form IV was relied on. Besides, she also participated in Andhra Pradesh 30th Senior Indian Round, Inter-District (State Level) Archery Championship held in 2023 and 67th AP School Games Inter-District (State Level) Archery Tournament Under-19 Girls held in 2023, and furnished certificate in Form II as well. 3rd respondent-SAAP merely considered Form II certificate and ignored Form IV certificate even after the same was verified and confirmed in the checklist, dated 31.08.2026.

Based on State-level participation, she had been assigned priority of 181, ignoring National-level participation.

(c) It is stated that during last academic year, considering M.Snehitha's participation at National level on the strength of very same certificate, SAAP had assigned priority of 151. Therefore, final revised list placing her in priority of 181 has been assailed.

4. Heard Sri Ghanta Rama Rao, learned Senior Counsel, appearing for K. Irfan, and Sri Posani Venkateswarlu, learned Senior Counsel, appearing for M. Snehitha, petitioners in both writ petitions; and learned Government Pleader for MH & FW, for 1st respondent State; Mrs.Tata Venkata Sridevi, learned Standing Counsel for 2nd respondent University; Mr.G.Sainarayana Rao, learned Standing Counsel for 3rd respondent SAAP; and Mr.Vivek Chandra Sekhar S., learned Standing Counsel for NMC.

5. Sri Ghanta Rama Rao, Ld. Senior Counsel appearing for K. Irfan/petitioner in W.P.No.30938 of 2026, contended that though his client furnished original Form II certificate, the same was ignored, and without giving due credence to the participation at State level, SAAP had assigned priority of 189, rather proper priority to be assigned would be 181. He further contended that if priority is revised to 181, inasmuch as 4th respondent has also been assigned same priority, by virtue of higher marks

secured by his client, he would be more meritorious and entitled to be considered for admission under sports quota.

6. Sri Posani Venkateswarlu, Ld. Senior Counsel appearing for M. Snehitha, petitioner in W.P.No.31536 of 2026, contended that SAAP had erroneously assigned priority of 181 ignoring Form IV submitted, which confirms participation at National level, in terms of which appropriate priority would be 151. He has drawn our attention to final priority list for previous academic year wherein petitioner was assigned priority of 151 on the strength of very same certificate.

7. Mr.G.Sai Narayana Rao, learned Standing Counsel for SAAP, appearing for 3rd respondent SAAP, placed on record written instructions, even dated 28.10.2026, in both writ petitions, which are taken on record subject to just exceptions. Based on said instructions, it is submitted that insofar as the case of K. Irfan is concerned, as original Form II has been submitted later, during grievance period, the same, if taken into consideration, his priority would stand revised as 181. Insofar as the case of M. Snehitha, it is stated that Form IV, which confirms participation at National level, was initially not considered, however, having realized that on the strength of very same certificate, in the previous academic year she had been allotted priority of 151, her priority would now be revised to 151. On instructions, he further submits that on account of revising priorities of both petitioners based on the strength of certificates sought to be relied on

by them, M. Snehitha, who secured higher priority of 151, would be higher in merit; thus, admission already granted to her shall stand undisturbed, and K. Irfan would not be entitled for any admission.

8. Mrs.T.V. Sridevi, learned Standing Counsel for 2nd respondent-University, submits that admission process has already been concluded on 26.10.2026, and therefore, issues raised in present cases, at this stage, would merely be academic. In support, reliance has been placed on order passed by co-ordinate Bench of this Court in Amal Bhumesh Battina v. State of A.P[1].

9. We have given our anxious consideration to the submissions made above and perused the record.

10. Mr. K. Irfan, secured 410 marks and he was assigned priority of 189 based on School Games Federation certificate issued in Form IV. He claimed better priority of 181 on the basis of State-level participation as evidenced by certificate in Form II. As per written instructions of 3rd respondent-SAAP, since original Form II was submitted later and the same was found to be genuine, priority would stand revised to 181. Insofar as Ms. M. Snehitha, she was assigned priority of 181 based on her participation at Senior State-level tournament. It is her case that National-level participation as evidenced by Form IV in School Games was not

[1] Order, dt.20.11.2025, in W.P.No.32505 of 2025 (APHC)

considered, though on the strength of very same certificate she was assigned priority of 151 during last academic year. SAAP does not deny the same, and in fact, it is stated that her priority would get revised to 151 having regard to Form IV certificate.

11. In sum and substance, claims made in both the writ petitions would succeed insofar as assigning priority is concerned. Be that as it may, Ms.M. Snehitha has already been granted admission in terms of her priority of 181. It is the case of K. Irfan that if priority in his case stands reassigned as 181 on par with Ms. M. Snehitha, on account of higher marks secured, he would stand chance for admission. However, as now even the priority assigned to Ms.M. Snehitha stands reassigned as 151, Mr.K.Irfan would have no chance at all. Therefore, admission already granted in favour of Ms.M.Snehitha cannot be disturbed and interfered with in these proceedings.

12. In view of above observations, both these writ petitions stand disposed of. No order as to costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

LISA GILL, CJ **CHALLA GUNARANJAN, J**

cs