APHC010577582026

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

THURSDAY, THE 12th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

WRIT PETITION NO: 31559 OF 2026

Between:

1. SIDDARTHA COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, Represented by its Secretary and Correspondent Sri K. N. V. Ranga Rao,S/o Bapiraju, Kothapeta, Tuni, East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, Represented by its Principal Secretary Higher Education Department Secretariat, Velagapudi, Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh.522238

2. Adikavi Nannaya University, Represented by its Registrar Rajamahendravaram, East Godavari District Andhra Pradesh.533101

3. The ViceChancellor cum Chairman Executive Council Adikavi Nannaya University, Rajamahendravaram, East Godavari District, Andhra Pradesh.533101

4. Dean, College Development Council Adikavi Nannaya University Rajamahendravaram, East Godavari District Andhra Pradesh.533101

5. The Competent Authority and Convenor, AP Ed.CET-2026 Admissions Dravidian University, Chittoor district, Andhra Pradesh. 517001

6. Commissioner of Higher Education, Government of Andhra Pradesh 0/o Commissioner of Higher Education AP D. No. 11-307, Garudadri KK Towers Sri Lakshmi Narasimha Colony, NH 5 Service Road, Near Dr. NTR Vaidya Seva Trust, Mandalagiri, Guntur District -522503, Andhra Pradesh

...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, declaring the action of the Respondents, particularly the 2nd to 4th Respondents, in failing to meaningfully and lawfully consider the explanations and supporting compliance records submitted by the Petitioner institution pursuant to show-cause notice dated 19-05-2026 and further proceedings dated 04-08-2026 styled as 'Speaking Order', and in substantially repeating the alleged deficiencies without communicating adequate reasons and failing to pass a lawful and time-bound decision on continuation of affiliation for the B.Ed. programme for academic year 2026-2027, thereby exposing the institution to exclusion from the counselling process, as arbitrary, illegal, contrary to Articles 14 and 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India, the applicable provisions of the National Council for Teacher Education Act, 1993 and Andhra Pradesh Universities Act, 1991, and the principles of natural justice, and consequently direct the Respondents to grant affiliation forthwith and before conclusion of second-phase counselling, with consequential consideration of the Petitioner for inclusion in the APEDCET 2026 counselling process

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 to direct the competent Respondents to forthwith consider and decide the

Petitioner institution's request for continuation of affiliation for the B.Ed. programme for academic year 2026-2027, after considering its explanations and compliance records before conclusion of the secondphase AP Ed.CET counselling process, and to consider provisionally including the Petitioner institution in the second-phase counselling against its earlier approved intake of 50 seats, pending disposal of the Writ Petition

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI VIJAY MATHUKUMILLI

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR HIGHER EDUCATION Counsel for the Respondents:KOTESWARA RAO MUTHINENI (STANDING COUNSEL FOR DRAVIDIAN UNIVERSITY)

The Court made the following order:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

WRIT PETITION NO: 31559 OF 2026

ORDER:

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Assistant Government Pleader appearing for the respondents.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the action of the second respondent in issuing the speaking order dated 04.08.2026, purportedly pursuant to the show-cause notice dated 19.05.2026 and the inspection conducted on 01.05.2026, in relation to continuation of affiliation for the B.Ed. programme for the academic year 2026-27.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the show-cause notice was issued on 19.05.2026, whereas the inspection was conducted on 01.05.2026, prior to issuance of the show-cause notice. It is further submitted that the petitioner submitted a detailed explanation and representation on 05.06.2026, along with as many as 37 attachments. However, the impugned speaking order does not refer to or consider the explanation submitted by the petitioner. It is further submitted that the second respondent ought to have conducted a re-inspection pursuant to the explanation and supporting documents submitted by the petitioner on 05.06.2026 and passed an appropriate reasoned order. Instead, the second respondent reiterated the deficiencies referred in the show-cause notice and the inspection report dated 01.05.2026, without considering the explanation submitted by the petitioner. It

is also submitted that the deficiencies pointed out in the speaking order can be verified by the competent authority by conducting a re-inspection and that an appropriate decision is required to be taken after considering the petitioner's explanation and supporting documents. Learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the second phase of counselling has already commenced and the allotment of seats is scheduled to commence from 19.11.2026. Learned counsel reports urgency in view of the schedule for Phase-II counselling and the subsequent spot counselling.

4. Learned Assistant Government Pleader appearing for the respondents submits that learned counsel appearing for the respondent No.2 is unwell.

5. Having regard to the submissions made and considering the urgency expressed by learned counsel for the petitioner in view of the ongoing counselling process, this Court is of the view that the impugned speaking order requires reconsideration, particularly as the explanation and supporting documents submitted by the petitioner on 05.06.2026 do not appear to have been considered.

6. Accordingly, the impugned speaking order dated 04.08.2026 issued by the second respondent is set aside. The second respondent is directed to conduct a re-inspection of the petitioner institution to verify the facilities available therein, duly taking into consideration the explanation and supporting documents submitted by the petitioner on 05.06.2026, and pass a reasoned

order in accordance with law, within a period of one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Pending such consideration, the petitioner college shall be permitted to participate in the scheduled counseling. However, it is made clear that, in the event if the second respondent, upon re-inspection, finds that the facilities and infrastructure available in the petitioner institution are not satisfactory for continuation of affiliation, the students allotted to the petitioner's college by the Convenor shall be re-allotted to other eligible colleges, in accordance with law.

8. With the above directions, this Writ Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE HARINATH.N

12.11.2026

Note:
CC by 13.11.2026
b/o
KKV

121

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

WRIT PETITION NO: 31559 OF 2026

Dt: 12.11.2026

KKV