



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

[3208]

THURSDAY, THE TWELFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

WRIT PETITION NO: 3621/2026

Between:

Mediseti Shankara Rao

...PETITIONER

AND

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others

...RESPONDENT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. G V SHIVAJI

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. GP FOR SERVICES II

2. SRINIVAS BASAVA

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

1. The present writ petition is filed seeking to issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of writ of Mandamus, declaring the impugned action of the 6th respondent in issuing impugned proceedings Ref.No.Estt/Gangavaram Branch/2024-25, dated 04.03.2025, imposing major penalty of reduction in rank

from the category of Manager to Assistant Manager, further imposing punishment of fixing the pay of the petitioner in first stage of basic pay in the pay scale of the post of Assistant Manager, which punishment is not at all contemplated under Service Regulations as highly illegal and arbitrary.

2. Heard Mr. G.V.Shivaji, learned counsel for the Petitioner and Mr. Srinivas Basava, learned Standing Counsel for the Respondents No. 5 and 6.

3. While assailing the punishment order passed by the Respondent No.6 is the question of jurisdiction of disciplinary authority. Such issue was already decided by the coordinate bench of this Court, vide order, dated 28.02.2025 in W.P.No.4903 of 2025 in identical matter and passed the following order, which reads as follows:-

“In the case at hand, the CEO placed the petitioner under suspension vide Ex.P3 and also issued Ex.P13 charge memo.

Thus, the appellate authority suspended the petitioner pending inquiry and also initiated disciplinary proceedings pending charge memo.

Whether the appellate authority is competent to place an employee under suspension, contrary to Clause 10.11 of Staff Service Regulations, requires consideration.

Learned standing counsel seeks time to file counter-affidavit.

Given the facts and circumstances, the suspension order, vide Ref.No. Estt/ Yeleswaram Branch/ 2024-25, dated 11.11.2024 (Ex.P.3) is hereby suspended. Since the jurisdiction of the CEO regarding issuance of Ex.P.13 charge memo is in dispute and in pursuance of suspension of Ex.P3, the 3rd

respondent is directed not to proceed with any disciplinary inquiry against the petitioner.”

4. Considering the submissions made and following the observations made in W.P.No.4903 of 2025, the instant Writ Petition is allowed, while setting aside the impugned proceedings dated 04.03.2025 issued by the Respondent No.6 and remanding the matter to the competent authority to proceed further as per rules in vogue. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

D. RAMESH,J

Date:12.02.2026

Gk.

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D. RAMESH

WRIT PETITION No.3621 OF 2026

Date:12.02.2026

Gk