



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

[3208]

WEDNESDAY, THE EIGHTEENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

WRIT PETITION NO: 4605/2026

Between:

1. CHUNDU KARTHIK,, S/O HANUMANTHARAO, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, OCC DATA ENTRY OPERATOR (OUT SOURCING), R/O ITHAVARAM VILLAGE, NANDIGAMA MANDAL KRISHNA DISTRICT, 521185.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, REVENUE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, GUNTUR DISTRICT. 522238
2. THE COLLECTOR, NTR DISTRICT, VIJAYAWADA. 520001
3. THE TAHSILDAR, NANDIGAMA, NTR DISTRICT. 521185
4. THE ANDHRA PRADESH CORPORATION FOR OUTSOURCED SERVICES, (APCOS), REP BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, 2ND FLOOR, NTR ADMINISTRATIVE BLOCK, PANDIT NEHRU BUSSTOP, VIJAYAWADA. 520001

...RESPONDENT(S):

The Court made the following ORDER:

1. This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following relief:

“to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of writ of Mandamus declaring the action Respondent No. 2 in issuing impugned proceedings vide Rc. Admn-2/487/2025-2 dated 12-02-2026 terminating the services of the petitioner as Data Entry Operator, office of Tahsildar Nandigama without issuing any show cause notice or conducting any enquiry and without giving any reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioner as arbitrary, illegal. Violation of Principles of natural justice and consequently direct the 2nd Respondent to continue the services of the petitioner as Data Entry Operator, office of Tahsildar Nandigama by setting aside the termination proceedings issued by the 2nd Respondent vide Rc. Admn-2/487/2025-2 dated 12-02-2026 in the interest of justice...”

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Pleader for the respondents.

3. The case of the petitioner is that he was appointed as a Data Entry Operator (Outsourcing) in the office of the Tahsildar, Nandigama, in the year 2019, and has been working continuously since then. It is submitted that in the year 2021, ACB officials conducted a surprise check in the said office, during which certain amounts of money were seized from the employees, including an amount of Rs.1,000/- found with the petitioner. However, no action was initiated by the Revenue Department at that time,

nor was any explanation sought from the petitioner. While the matter stood thus, the 2nd respondent, vide notice dated 09.12.2025, proposed to terminate the services of the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner was found in possession of an unaccounted amount of Rs.1,000/- during the said ACB check conducted on 10.12.2021, and called upon the petitioner to submit his explanation. The petitioner submitted his representation dated 11.12.2025 stating that the said amount was carried for purchasing medicines for his aged parents and that it was neither a bribe nor intended for any illegal purpose. However, without considering the explanation submitted by the petitioner and without conducting any proper enquiry or affording an opportunity of personal hearing, the 2nd respondent issued proceedings dated 12.02.2026. It is submitted that the impugned action of the respondents is in clear violation of the principles of natural justice, as no show cause notice, enquiry, or reasonable opportunity was provided to the petitioner. Further, the action has been taken after an inordinate delay of more than three years, without assigning proper reasons for rejecting the explanation submitted by the petitioner. It is also submitted that, as per GAD Circular Instructions, a government employee is permitted to carry an amount of Rs.1,000/- while on duty. Therefore, the action of the 2nd respondent in terminating the services of the petitioner is illegal and arbitrary. Hence the writ petition.

4. After lapse of four (04) years the respondent authorities have issued notice dated 09.12.2025 with the following observations:-

“In the reference 1st cited, the chief commissioner of land administration, Andhra Pradesh has informed that the director general, ACB has submitted report to the government on the surprise check of tahsildar’s office, Nandigama conducted on 10.12.2021, in which inter-alia it was recommended for removal of three (03) outsourcing employees who are working in the Tahsildar’s office, Nandigama at the time of surprise check.

The chief commissioner of land administration, Andhra Pradesh has finally directed to take necessary action to terminate the outsourcing employees from service as per the recommendations of the ACB/instructions of the Government and to submit action taken report.

In their report, the director general, ACB has recommended to remove the following outsourcing employee from service due to the irregularities noted against him:

<i>Sl.No</i>	<i>Name of the employee</i>	<i>Irregularities noticed</i>
<i>1.</i>	<i>Sri Chundu Karthik, Data Entry Operator, O/o.Tahsildar, Nandigama(outsourcing)</i>	<i>He has kept an unaccounted amount of Rs.1000/- with him and failed to account for it.</i>

In view of the above, Sri Chandu Karthik, Data Entry Operator. O/o.Tahsildar, Nandigama (outsourcing) is hereby directed to submit his written representation if any, on the action proposed for termination of his service from revenue department, within 15 days from the date of the receipt of the copy of the notice, failing which it will be construed the above individual has no grounds to submit his representation and further action will be initiated as per the available record”.

5. However, though the petitioner submitted his explanation, the same was not considered, and the impugned order dated 12.02.2026 was passed solely based on the directions of the Chief Commissioner of Land Administration. It is further submitted that, at the time of the ACB raid, the petitioner had explained that the amount was brought for purchasing medicines for his mother, and the ACB authorities did not seize the said

amount. Despite this, after a lapse of four years, and without conducting any enquiry or affording any opportunity, the 2nd respondent passed the impugned order, which is stigmatic in nature.

6. As held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Vijayakumaran C.P.V. vs. Central University of Kerala and others*, where termination is founded on allegations or casts a stigma, the employee must be put on notice and afforded an opportunity of hearing. In the present case, although a notice was issued on 09.12.2025 pursuant to the directions of the Chief Commissioner of Land Administration dated 14.10.2025, and the petitioner submitted his explanation, the same has not been considered, nor have any reasons been assigned in the impugned order. Inasmuch as the impugned order is stigmatic in nature, the respondents ought not to have passed the same without affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel on both sides and on perusal of the material available on record, this court is of the considered view that, the writ petition is allowed by setting aside the impugned order dated 12.02.2026 and the matter is remanded to the 2nd respondent to pass appropriate and reasoned orders, after duly considering the explanation submitted by the petitioner and after affording him an opportunity of personal hearing. There shall be no order as to costs.

Consequently, Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in the writ petition shall stand closed.

18.02.2026
klk

JUSTICE D RAMESH

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

WRIT PETITION NO: 4605/2026

18.12.2026

klk