APHC010572932026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

Bench Sr.No:-8 [3584]

WRIT PETITION NO: 31698 of 2026

Dr.Pulidindi Sneha, ...Petitioner

Vs.

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

****

CORAM : THE CHIEF JUSTICE LISA GILL

SRI JUSTICE CHALLA GUNARANJAN

DATE : 30th October 2026

Present:

Advocate for Petitioner: B SESIBUSHAN RAO

Advocate(s) for Respondent(s): GP FOR MEDICAL HEALTH FW, GP FOR GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

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

Prayer in this writ petition is as follows:

"to issue an appropriate Writ, Order or Direction, more particularly a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ declaring the action of Respondent No. 2 University in treating the Petitioner as a Non-Local Candidate for admission to Postgraduate Medical Degree/Diploma Courses under the Competent Authority Quota for the Academic Year 2026-2027 as arbitrary,

illegal and contrary to Paragraph 4(1) and Paragraph 4(2)(a) of the Andhra Pradesh Educational Institutions (Regulation of Admissions) Order, 1974, as amended by the Andhra Pradesh Educational Institutions (Regulation of Admissions) Amendment Order, 2022, read with Section 95 of the Andhra Pradesh Reorganisation Act, 2014 and consequently, direct the Respondents to treat the Petitioner as a Local Candidate of the Andhra University Area in terms of the aforesaid provisions for admission to Postgraduate Medical Degree/Diploma Courses under the Competent Authority Quota for the Academic Year 2026-2027, and pass such other orders."

2. (a) Petitioner pursued school and intermediate education in erstwhile East Godavari district and Krishna district of State of Andhra Pradesh during the years 2017 and 2019 respectively. Later, petitioner pursued Under Graduation in MBBS, having secured admission in competent authority quota in State of Telangana during the academic year 2019-20 and completed by January 2024. She later appeared for NEET-PG-2026 and secured All India Rank of 40,236.

(b) 2nd respondent issued notification dated 14.10.2026 publishing prospectus of competent authority quota (in-service and non-service) admissions into PG medical degree/diploma courses for the academic year 2026-2027. Petitioner, when tried to make

online application claiming as local candidate, her status was not accepted as local candidate, rather, she was classified as a non-local candidate, notwithstanding that, by domicile, she belonged to State of Andhra Pradesh.

(c) In this background, present writ petition came to be filed.

3. Heard Sri B.Seshibushan Rao, learned counsel appearing for petitioner and Smt.T.V.Sridevi, learned standing counsel appearing for respondents.

4. (a) Learned counsel for petitioner contended that petitioner, since completed MBBS course in State of Telangana in January 2024, which was within the window period of 10 years after bifurcation of State, by virtue of protection granted under Section 95 of AP State Reorganisation Act, 2014, for all purposes, she had to be treated as local candidate.

(b) Further, it is also contended that even as per Para 4(2)(a) of Andhra Pradesh Educational Institutions (Regulation of Admissions) Order, 1974, inasmuch as petitioner completed MBBS course within 10 years period of the benefit given under Section 95, she has to be regarded as local candidate considering longest period during the seven consecutive academic years of relevant qualifying examination.

(c) In support of aforesaid submissions, petitioner placed reliance on judgment of Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **Dr.Sireesha Simhadri v. State of Andhra Pradesh[1].**

5. (a) Conversely, learned Standing Counsel for 2nd respondent, submitted that issue raised in the writ petition is squarely covered by orders of this Court in **Dr.Munjeti Pavani v. State of Andhra Pradesh[2]**, **Dr.Beera Sharon Keerthana v. State of Andhra Pradesh[3]** and **Dr.Jatothu Aravinda Kumar v. State of Andhra Pradesh[4]**.

(b) It is also submitted that benefit granted under Section 95 of A.P. State Reorganisation Act, since ended on 1st June, 2024, mandate under Presidential Order would stand revived, unless candidate satisfies Para 4 of said Presidential Order, local status cannot be conferred. The Government, in fact, had issued Circular dated 21.07.2025 clarifying aforesaid position, which was taken judicial notice in case of **Dr.Jathothu Aravinda Kumar[4]**, thus urged for dismissal of writ petition.

---

[1] 2022 (2) ALT 268
[2] 2025 SCC OnLine AP 3768
[3] W.P. No.30959 of 2026, order dated 28.10.2026
[4] W.P. No.31178 of 2026, order dated 27.10.2026

6. Prospectus issued by 2nd respondent notifying admissions, in clause 3.4, sets out criteria regarding local candidates. It is pari materia with definition of local candidate as provided in Presidential Order.

7. The question whether candidate passing out MBBS course outside State of Andhra Pradesh, either it be in State of Telangana or for that matter any other State or Country, is entitled to be treated as local candidate, notwithstanding such candidates reside within the State, has been considered and answered in negative by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court as well as by us in **Dr.Munjeti Pavani[2]** and **Dr.Beera Sharoon Keerthana[3]**. However, learned counsel for petitioner tried to distinguish aforesaid judgments by submitting that Section 95 of A.P. State Reorganisation Act, which extended special benefits during the transition period, was not considered therein.

8. Section 95 of State Reorganisation Act had provided for continuation of existing common admission process in relation to admissions in all Government or private institutions including medical institutions, which subsisted for a period of 10 years from 02.06.2014 till 01.06.2024. Once mandate under Section 95 has come to an end on 01.06.2024, benefits otherwise extended during

transition period would no longer be available. The Government had also issued Circular dated 21.07.2025 clarifying aforesaid position.

9. Merely because petitioner had completed MBBS course in State of Telangana before 01.06.2024, she cannot claim local status. Petitioner necessarily has to satisfy Para 4 of Presidential Order besides Clause 3.4 of Prospectus. Therefore, we do not find any merit in the writ petition.

10. Accordingly, this writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending consideration, if any, in this case shall stand closed.

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

SS