

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH::AT AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE No. W.A.No.162 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
1.	18.02.2026	<u>DEV,J & SS,J</u> <u>W.A.No.162 of 2026</u> Admit. Issue notice to the respondents. Post the matter in the usual course for hearing. _____ DEV, J _____ SS,J <u>I.A.No.1 of 2026</u> Dispensed with for the present. _____ DEV, J _____ SS,J <u>I.A.No.2 of 2026</u> Heard Sri P.Gangaiah Naidu, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant/writ petitioner, learned Government Pleader for Endowments for the respondent Nos.1 and 2 and Sri T.Venu Gopal,	Contd..

		learned Standing Counsel for the respondent No.3 and Sri V.Venugopala Rao, learned Senior counsel for the respondent No.4. Perused the material available on record. It appears that the method of appointment for the post of “Mukhya Archaka” is by promotion from Category-IV i.e. “Archaka” and the eligibility is that the person should have passed the “Archaka Pravara” examination. The petitioner passed the said examination in the year 2019, but the respondent No.4 did not possess the said eligibility. The case of the respondent No.4 is that from 2019 onwards, the examination is not conducted by the official respondents. Due to that reason, considering the seniority of the respondent No.4, the respondent No.2 has passed an order granting exemption to the respondent No.4 to appear for the examination and he is permitted to get qualification within a year and to get promotion. Having considered the rule position and facts and circumstances of the case, it appears that for the post of “Mukhya Archaka” one should have pass the “Archaka Pravara” examination and the writ	
--	--	---	--

petitioner has passed the said examination in the year 2019 itself. As and when a person is available with the requisite eligibilities, the official respondents should have considered his case for granting promotion to the post of “Mukhya Archaka”. One can understand that, if no eligible candidate is available for the post of “Mukhya Archaka”, the official respondents may grant exemption to the respondent No.4 to consider him for promotion. But as the eligible candidate is available, taking steps to promotion to the respondent No.4 by granting exemption appears to be illegal and contrary to the relevant rules. It appears that the learned Single Judge while dismissing the Writ Petition did not consider this aspect.

In our *prima facie* view, the order of the learned Single Judge is liable to be suspended.

Accordingly, there shall be an interim suspension, as prayed for.

DEV, J

SS,J

CMK/SCS