APHC010573642026

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

TUESDAY, THE 3rd DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

WRIT PETITION NO: 31478 OF 2026

Between:

1. TUPAKULA LAKSHMI, W/o. Late Tupakula Vijaya Kumar Aged 41 Years, Rio. D No. 10-149, Padmasarassu Village, Karvetinagaram Mandal, Chittoor District

...PETITIONER

AND

1. The State Of Andhra Pradesh, Rep by Its Principal Secretary, Women Development and Child Welfare Department, Secretariat Bldgs, Velagapudi, Guntur District. 522237
2. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep by Its Principal Secretary, Tribal Welfare (CV) Development Secretariat Bldgs, Velagapudi, Guntur District. 522237
3. The Director, Women Development and Child Welfare Department, Guntur, Guntur District. 522002
4. The Regional Joint Director, Women Development and Child Welfare Department, Kurnool, Kurnool District 518001
5. The District Women and Child Welfare and Empowerment Officer, Chittoor, Chittoor District. 517002
6. Child Development Project Officer Cum Integrated Child Development Service Project officer, Nagari, Chittoor District. 517590

...RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased toissue a Writ, Order or Direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, to declare the Memo No. 373/A2/2024 dated 14.10.2026 issued by the 4th Respondent stated why the petitioner shall not impose punishment of removal of service by ignoring statutory appeal pending before the 2nd Respondent filed on 24.9.2025 against the proceeding of the District Collector, Chittoor passed in Proc REVCSECOVC(MIS) /2/ 480605/ 2024/ MAGL1, dated 25.8.2025 is illegal, arbitrary and contrary to law and violate of Articles 14,19, 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently suspend the

Memo No. 373/A2/2024 dated 14.10.2026 issued by the 4th Respondent till the disposal of Appeal pending before the 2 n0 Respondent against the proceeding of the District Collector, Chittoor passed in Proc REVCSECOVC(MIS)/2/480605/2024/MAGL1dated 25.8.2025 in the interest of justice

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

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 stay of all further proceedings pursuant to Memo No. 373/A2/2024 dated 14.10.2026 issued by the 4TH Respondent against the petitioner, till the disposal of Appeal dated 24.9.2025 pending before the 2ND respondent against the proceeding of the District Collector, Chittoor passed in Proc REV-CSECOVC(MIS)/2/ 480605/ 2024/ MAGL1dated 25.8.2025 in the interest of justice

Counsel for the Petitioner: T C KRISHNAN

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR WOMEN DEV CHILD

WELFARE Counsel for the Respondents:GP FOR SERVICES I

The Court made the following order:

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY

W.P.No.31478 of 2026

ORDER:

This Writ Petition is filed to declare the Memo No.373/A2/2024 dated 14.10.2026 issued by Respondent No.4 as illegal and arbitrary.

2. Petitioner belongs to B.C. community and had married to one Tupakula Vijaya Kumar, who belongs to Yanadi Scheduled Tribe community on 10.02.2003.

3. Thereafter, the Petitioner was appointed as Anganwadi worker in the year 2010 pursuant to a notification for recruitment after due selection process in non-Scheduled Tribe category and was discharging her duties.

4. While so, Petitioner was appointed as Extension Officer Grade-II Supervisor as she is claimed as a Scheduled Tribe on account of her marriage and Community Certificate issued in the year 2019. A complaint was lodged against the Petitioner regarding the social status of the Petitioner as Scheduled Tribe. Pursuant thereto, an enquiry was conducted by the District Level Scrutiny Committee under the relevant Act, the community certificate of the Petitioner was cancelled on 25.08.2025. An appeal is said to be filed thereon and is pending before the Government.

5. While so, a charge memo was issued against the Petitioner on 03.09.2025, whereunder an Article of charge was framed that the Petitioner had applied for the post of Extension Officer Grade-II

Supervisor by submitting a false Scheduled Tribe caste certificate issued by the Tahsildar, Karevinagaram on 29.06.2021 and got selected to the said post. After enquiry, a show cause notice was issued to the Petitioner vide impugned proceedings dated 14.10.2026 to show cause as to why punishment of 'removal of service' should not be imposed on the Petitioner. Questioning the same, present writ petition is filed.

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that an appeal is filed against the order of cancellation of the community certificate and the same is pending before the Government and that the impugned show cause notice is issued with a prejudiced opinion as the nature of punishment was also specified.

7. Learned Government Pleader submits that the impugned notice is only a show cause notice and no cause of action is available to the Petitioner to file the present writ petition. It is further stated that the punishment referred to in the impugned show cause is only a proposed punishment and the same is said to have been issued with prejudice.

8. Heard Sri T.C.Krishnan, learned counsel for the Petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Services-I.

9. The impugned notice is only a show-cause notice, and the scope of interference by this Court is limited. The impugned show-cause notice clearly states that as to "why the punishment of removal from service should not be imposed" and in the opinion of this Court, the same cannot be said to be a prejudiced opinion and the further steps

would be dependent on the explanation to be offered by the Petitioner. The pendency of appeal against the cancellation of Caste Certificate is not a ground to defer the disciplinary proceedings and in the event Petitioner succeeds in the appeal, she can seek for restitution in the event any penalty is imposed pursuant to the impugned show cause notice.

10. Therefore, this Court does not find any merit in the writ petition and accordingly the same is dismissed leaving it open to the Respondent-Authority to consider the explanation of the Petitioner and pass appropriate orders. No order as to costs.

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

NYAPATHY VIJAY, J

Date: 03.11.2026
KLP