

APHC010068372026



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

[3208]

MONDAY, THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

WRIT PETITION NO: 3884/2026

Between:

- 1.G. LEKHYA, , D/O G.VENKAT RAM REDDY, AGED 31 YEARS,
RESIDING AT VILLA-160, MAYFAIR VILLAS, TELLAPUR, HYDERABAD,
502032.

...PETITIONER

AND

- 1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, GENERALADMINISTRATION,
SECRETARIATBUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, 522238.
- 2.AP PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, REP BY ITS SECRETARY, NEW
GOVERNMENT OFFICES BUILDING, 2ND FLOOR M G ROAD,
BANDHARROAD, OPPOSITE INDIRA GANDHI MUNICIPAL COMPLEX,
VIJAYAWADA, 520010.
- 3.P JAYAVARDHAN CHOWDARY, S/O P VENKATESH, AGE33, R/O FLAT
NO 301, 3RD FLOOR, G R APPARTMENTS, HINDUPUR, SATHYASAI
DISTRICT, AP.
- 4.THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, SRI SATHYA SAI DISTRICT,
HEADQUARTERS AT PUTTAPARTHI, COLLECTORATE OFFICE,
ANDHRA PRADESH - 515134
- 5.THE TAHSILDAR, GORANTLA MANDAL, SRI SATHYA SAI
DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 515134 RESPONDENT NOS.4
AND 5 IMPEADED AS PER COURT ORDER DATED 19.02.2026 VIDE
IA.NO.3 OF 2026 IN WP.NO.3884 OF 2026

...RESPONDENT(S):

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 to may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the Nature of Writ of Mandamus to declare the action of the pertaining to Notification No. 12 of 2023 dated 08.12.2023 especially with regard to records

pertaining to R3 including his application forms and the certificates filed /produced by him, especially pertaining to EWS Certificate and consequently hold that R3 would not fall with in the meaning of EWS as per law and in view of the financial status and further direct R2 to debar R3 from participating in the selection process pertaining to Notification No 12/2023 and to take further steps under para 16.1 of the said notification for submitting false certificates and claiming the false claim amounting to mockery of selection process and hold action of the second respondent in not taking immediate steps against the third respondent despite the representation of the petitioner dated 28.01.2026 with necessary material leading to miscarriage of justice as bad, illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional by issuance and to pass such

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 may be pleased to direct respondent 1 &2 especially R2 to treat the 3rd respondent as ineligible candidates for the selection process in pursuance of Notification No. 12 of 2023 dated 08.12.2023 and explode him from the selection process in view of his misrepresentation and submitting false certificates and to pass such

IA NO: 2 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 may be pleased to direct the 2nd respondent to debar the 3rd respondent from Notification No. 12 of 2023 dated 08.12.2023 and to take further action under para 16.1 of the said notification and to pass such

IA NO: 3 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 May be pleased to permit the petitioner to implead the proposed Respondent No 4 And 5 as Respondent no 4 and 5 in the W.P. No. 3884 of 2026 in the interest of justice and to pas

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.J SUDHEER

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1. NALABOLU VENKATA PAVANKUMAR
2. GP FOR SERVICES I
3. V.VENKATA NAGA RAJU (SC FOR APPSC)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH

AT AMARAVATI

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

APHC010104542026

[3208]



MONDAY, THE TWENTY SEVENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

WRIT PETITION NO: 5887/2026

Between:

1. Y MOUNIKA, D/O Y. LAKSHMI MOHAN REDDY, AGED 32 YEARS,
RESIDING AT HIG-33, HOUSING BOARD COLONY, NANDYAL,
KURNOOL DISTRICT 518502.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION, SECRETARIAT
BUILDINGS, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI, 522238.

2. AP PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, REP BY ITS SECRETARY,
NEW GOVERNMENT OFFICES BUILDING, 2ND FLOOR M G
ROAD, BANDHARROAD, OPPOSITE INDIRA GANDHI
MUNICIPAL COMPLEX, VIJAYAWADA, 520010.

3. P JAYAVARDHAN CHOWDARY, S/O P VENKATESH, AGE 33, R/O
FLAT NO 301, 3RD FLOOR, G R APPARTMENTS HINDUPUR,
SATHYASAI DISTRICT, AP.

4. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR, SRI SATHYA SAI DISTRICT,
HEADQUARTERS AT PUTTAPARTHI, COLLECTORATE OFFICE,
ANDHRA PRADESH. 515134

5. THE TAHSILDAR, GORANTIA MANDAL, SRI SATHYA SAI
DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH. 515134

...RESPONDENT(S):

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 topleased to issue a writ, order or. direction more particularly one in the Nature of Writ of Mandamus to declare the action of the pertaining to Notification No. 12 of 2023 dated 08.12.2023 especially with regard to records pertaining to R3 including his application forms andthe certificates filed /produced by him, especially pertaining to EWS Certificate and-consequently hold that R3 would not fall with in the meaning of EWS as per. law aaid in view of the financial status of the family and further direct R2 to debar R3 from participating in the selection process pertaining to Notification No 12/2023 and to take further steps under para 16.1 of the said notification for submitting false certificates ,and further direct R2 not to consider R3 under general category as well as per para 4.13 of the said notification and hence declare R3 as not eligible for the post of ACST (CTO) and for that matter for any post for submitting false certificate/claim amounting to mockery of selection preeess leading to miscarriage of justice as bad, illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional by insurance of writ of mandamus and to pass

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 pleased to direct respondent 1 & 2 especially R2 to treat the 3rd respondent as ineligible candidates for the selection process in pursuance of Notification No. 12 of 2023 dated 08.12.2023 and exclude him from the selection process in view of his misrepresentation and submitting false certificates and to pass

IA NO: 2 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 pleased to direct the 2nd respondent to debar the 3rd respondent from Notification No. 12 of 2023 dated 08.12.2023 and to take further action under para 16.1 of the said notification and further direct R2 not to consider R3 for any post under general category as per para 4.13 of the said notification and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.J SUDHEER

COMMON ORDER:

1. Since the issues involved in the present writ petition are identical, this Court is inclined to follow the common order passed in the connected matters.
2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners, the learned Government Pleader appearing for respondent No.1, and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for respondent No.2.
3. The case of the petitioners is that they participated in the recruitment process initiated under Notification No.12 of 2023 dated 08.12.2023 by submitting their application under the sports quota for appointment to Group-I Services. Respondent No.3 also participated in the same recruitment process by claiming reservation under the Economically Weaker Sections (EWS) category. Earlier, disputes relating to the certificates submitted by both the petitioners and respondent No.3 were the subject matter of adjudication before this Court in W.P.No.25040 of 2025, wherein this Court issued the following directions:

“Accordingly, all the writ petitions are disposed of by remanding the matter to the Sports Authority of Andhra Pradesh to place the entire issue before the Grievance Committee. The Committee shall issue notice to the petitioners as well as the objectors and, after conducting a thorough enquiry and affording an opportunity to all concerned, consider the matter and prepare the final priority list with specific findings. The same shall

thereafter be forwarded to the APPSC for finalization of the selections for Group-I and Group-II Services. The entire exercise shall be completed within a period of one (01) month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”

4. During the pendency of the said proceedings, the petitioners allegedly came to know that respondent No.3 had applied under the EWS category by relying upon the amendment made to Rule 22 of the Andhra Pradesh State and Subordinate Service Rules, 1996 vide G.O.Ms.No.73 dated 04.08.2021. The said amendment was issued for implementation of 10% reservation in favour of Economically Weaker Sections in accordance with the Constitution (One Hundred and Third Amendment) Act, 2019. Under the said amendment, the term “family” includes the candidate seeking reservation, his/her parents, siblings below the age of 18 years, spouse, and children below the age of 18 years.

Further, Rule 2(31) was amended by insertion of Rule 2(32), which defines “Economically Weaker Sections” as persons who are not covered under the existing reservation schemes meant for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Socially and Educationally Backward Classes, and whose gross annual family income does not exceed Rs.8,00,000/-.

5. The contention of the petitioners is that the salary slips and salary certificate pertaining to the father of respondent No.3 disclose that the annual family income exceeds Rs.8,00,000/-. Therefore, the respondent No.3 is not entitled to claim the benefit of reservation under the EWS

category. The learned counsel for the petitioners further relies upon Para 16(1) of Notification dated 08.12.2023, which stipulates that any candidate furnishing incorrect information, making false declarations regarding eligibility, or suppressing material information at any stage of the selection process is liable to be debarred for a period up to five years from appearing in examinations conducted by the Commission, apart from rejection of candidature.

6. Placing reliance upon the aforesaid provision, he further contends that the candidature of respondent No.3 ought to have been rejected and appropriate action ought to have been initiated against him for allegedly furnishing false information. It is further pleaded that though the petitioners submitted a representation dated 28.01.2026 bringing the said facts to the notice of respondent No.2, no action has been initiated against respondent No.3, hence the present writ petition.

7. Upon service of notice, respondent No.2 filed a counter affidavit stating that the applications submitted by the candidates have not yet been subjected to scrutiny. It is stated that respondent No.3 was permitted to participate in the preliminary as well as mains written examinations and that verification of original certificates, including the EWS certificate, would arise only if a candidate falls within the zone of consideration for oral test/interview. It is further stated that the respondent No.3 was not called for certificate verification either under the general category, due to low

merit, or under the sports quota, owing to non-consideration of candidates under the sports category in the final priority list approved by the Government Level Committee. Hence, the EWS certificate submitted by respondent No.3 has not yet been subjected to verification as his candidature had not progressed to the stage of oral test/interview.

8. The learned Government Pleader appearing for the respondents also placed on record written instructions issued by respondent No.4 dated 24.03.2026 and 27.04.2026, wherein it is disclosed that respondent No.4 had referred the matter to the Chief Commissioner of Land Administration (CCLA) on 20.04.2026 seeking clarification with respect to the EWS certificate of respondent No.3.

9. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that once prima facie material is available indicating that respondent No.3 submitted a false declaration, respondent No.2 is duty-bound to initiate action under Para 16(1) of the notification without waiting for the stage of certificate verification. It is contended that the salary particulars of the father of respondent No.3 clearly establish that the annual family income exceeds the prescribed limit and, therefore, the respondent No.3 wrongly claimed reservation under the EWS category. According to the petitioner, once such information was brought to the notice of respondent No.2, the authority ought to have examined the income particulars, landed properties, and other relevant records of respondent No.3 and initiated

proceedings under Para 16(1) of the notification. It is contended that due to the inaction of the respondent No.2, the petitioner was constrained to approach this Court.

10. Per contra, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent No.3 raised a preliminary objection regarding the maintainability of the writ petition. It is submitted that respondent No.3 obtained the EWS certificate in the year 2023 in accordance with G.O.Ms.No.104 dated 23.09.2021. It is further submitted that respondent No.3 got married in the year 2021 and has been residing separately from his father thereafter. The learned Senior Counsel contends that the Tahsildar, Hindupur, upon conducting an enquiry on the application submitted by respondent No.3, issued the EWS certificate in the year 2023. It is further argued that the petitioners neither challenged the said certificate before the competent authority nor preferred any appeal questioning its validity.

11. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the 3rd respondent contended that so long as the EWS certificate issued in favour of respondent No.3 remains valid and subsisting, the provisions of Para 16(1) of the notification cannot be invoked unless the certificate is first declared invalid by the competent authority. It is further contended that respondent No.4 had no authority to seek clarification from the CCLA in the absence of any pending proceedings relating to cancellation or verification of the certificate before the competent authority. The learned Senior Counsel

also questioned the enquiry allegedly conducted by the Tahsildar, Gorantla Mandal, contending that the said authority lacks jurisdiction, since the certificate was issued by the Tahsildar, Hindupur Mandal. Serious objection is therefore raised with regard to the enquiry conducted by respondent No.5. It is contended that neither respondent No.4 nor respondent No.5 has jurisdiction to examine the validity of the EWS certificate issued in favour of respondent No.3 and, therefore, the writ petition is premature and liable to be dismissed.

12. In reply thereto, the learned counsel for the petitioners, while fairly accepting certain submissions advanced on behalf of respondent No.2, reiterated that Para 16(1) of the notification empowers respondent No.2 to consider complaints at any stage of the selection process. Therefore, once the complaint was brought to the notice of respondent No.2, the authority was under an obligation to initiate appropriate action in accordance with Para 16(1) of the notification.

13. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for all the parties, the point that arises for consideration in the present writ petition is whether the petitioners, without possessing proper knowledge or without challenging the certificate issued in favour of respondent No.3 before the competent authority, and merely on the basis of salary slips and details relating to the landed properties of the father of respondent No.3, is entitled to submit a complaint/application alleging false

claim under the EWS category, and further, whether respondent No.2 is justified in initiating action under Para 16(1) of the notification solely on the basis of such complaint.

14. On perusal of the material available on record, it is evident that certain litigations are already pending between the petitioners and respondent No.3 with regard to the sports category and that this Court had earlier considered the said disputes and referred the matter to the concerned authorities for appropriate consideration. During the pendency of the said issue, if the petitioners were of the view that the EWS certificate issued in favour of respondent No.3 was contrary to the provisions contained in G.O.Ms.No.73 dated 04.08.2021, it was always open to the petitioners to avail the remedies available under law by filing an appropriate application seeking cancellation of the certificate before the competent authority along with relevant material, or by bringing the said issue to the notice of the authorities through proper proceedings. However, on examination of the record, it appears that no such proceedings were initiated by the petitioners questioning the validity of the EWS certificate issued in favour of respondent No.3 before the competent authority.

15. Admittedly, in the present case, no competent authority has adjudicated upon the validity of the certificate issued in favour of respondent No.3. Further, the said certificate has neither been recalled nor cancelled by any competent authority. In the absence of any such finding

or determination regarding the invalidity of the certificate, the question of entertaining the complaint submitted by the petitioners under Para 16(1) of the notification does not arise at this stage. As stated by respondent No.2 in the counter affidavit, if any issue arises during the process of certificate verification relating to any selected candidate, appropriate steps may be taken by referring the matter to the competent authority.

16. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to entertain the Writ Petitions. Accordingly, the Writ Petitions are dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

27.04.2026

klk

JUSTICE D RAMESH

155

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

WRIT PETITION NO: 3884/2026

27.04.2026

klk