

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH::AT AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE No: W.A.No.258 of 2024 and batch

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	10.08.2026	<u>DR,J & AGD,J</u> Heard both the learned counsel. In view of the compliance with the orders passed by this Court dated 24.07.2026, an interim report has been submitted before this Court today, after obtaining reports from the Central Forensic Science Laboratory (CFSL), Hyderabad. It is submitted that certain reports are still awaited and, therefore, further time is sought for obtaining and submitting the remaining reports. This Court, vide order dated 11.02.2026, had considered the entire issue in detail and passed the following order: “26. Accordingly, we pass the following order: <i>(i) The State Government is directed to constitute a Special Investigation Team (SIT) to conduct investigation or re-constitute the present SIT.</i> <i>(ii) The Special Investigation Team should be headed by an Officer not below the rank of Additional Director General of Police.</i> <i>(iii) The learned Advocate General shall furnish the details of SIT within three (03) days to the Registrar (Judicial), for the purpose of impleadment.</i> <i>iv) Registrar (Judicial) shall implead the Special</i>	

		<i>Investigation [SIT] as party-Respondent No.30 in the W.A.No.258 of 2024.</i> <i>27. The respondent No.30/SIT in W.A.No.258 of 2024 is directed to investigate by taking assistance of scientific and forensic experts of any Central Forensic Science Laboratory situate outside the State on the following aspects:-</i> <i>1) Whether the answer scripts of all the selected candidates are intact and whether there is any tampering in any form.</i> <i>2) Whether the Bar codes on answer sheets, original OMR sheets and OMR sheets used during physical valuation at Vijayawada, and the details retrieved from such bar codes, are same in respect of selected candidates.</i> <i>3) The answer sheets of the unselected candidates, who are parties before this Court and in the writ petitions, shall be examined in the same lines, as how the answer sheets of the selected candidates are examined.</i> <i>4). The answer sheets of the candidates up to 100 numbers below in the merit list, from the last selected candidate shall be examined in the same lines, as that of selected candidates.</i> <i>5) The material already collected by Special Investigation Team (SIT) investigating the matter so far can also be used for further probe as directed in the lines herein above.</i> <i>6) Apart from the above any other relevant information, which suggests tampering with the original answer sheets may be detected adopting the scientific and other techniques.</i> <i>7) The report shall be submitted by SIT on or before 16.03.2026.</i>	
--	--	---	--

In compliance with the aforesaid order of this Court, the State Government constituted the Special Investigation Team (SIT), headed by Dr. Ravi Shankar Ayyanar, I.P.S., Director General of Police. Subsequently, considering the request made on behalf of the SIT, this Court, vide order dated 13.07.2026, extended the time for submission of the report.

Pursuant to the said order, the Special Investigation Team conducted the investigation/enquiry under the supervision of Dr. Ravi Shankar Ayyanar, I.P.S., Director General of Police, and has submitted its findings/report in a sealed cover before this Court. It is further brought to the notice of this Court that, out of the nine papers/materials which were sent to the CFSL Centres for forensic examination, the SIT has received reports in respect of two papers/materials. However, the CFSL authorities, in respect of the remaining seven papers/materials, have requested a further period of two weeks for submitting their reports. Therefore, it is submitted that the remaining forensic reports are awaited and that the same would be placed before this Court immediately upon receipt.

When the matter is taken up for consideration, the learned counsel appearing for both sides have requested that copies of the reports submitted before this Court be furnished to them so as to enable them to make their submissions on the merits of the matter. In support of the said request, the learned counsel have placed reliance upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in

		(2006) 11 Supreme Court Cases 356, <i>Inderpreet Singh Kahlon and Others v. State of Punjab and Others</i>, wherein, in somewhat similar circumstances, the Hon'ble Supreme Court considered the issue relating to furnishing of reports and documents relied upon by the authorities. The relevant observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court read as follows: <i>16. At the hearing of the said writ petition, however, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the writ petitioners stated that they had no objection to the said Hon'ble Judges hearing the writ petitions. On or about 30-1-2002, the appellant judicial officers filed an application for supply of copies of the reports as also the documents including the answer books which had been relied upon by the High Court at one point of time or the other for the purpose of passing the orders of termination. The High Court claimed privilege as regards the reports of the committee. The State of Punjab also took a stand that the contents of the report of the Vigilance Bureau could not be disclosed, as by reasons thereof, the investigation of the case may be put in jeopardy. Oral submissions on behalf of the judicial officers were closed on 5-2-2003 and they were asked to file written submissions by 6-2-2003; but curiously, however, on 6-2-2003 the reports of the committee as also the mark sheets were made available for inspection of the learned counsel.</i> <i>17. During hearing before the High Court, interestingly, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State made a statement that those candidates who had become successful in the subsequent re-conducted interviews or re-conducted examinations, as the case may be, shall be taken back in service and their seniority would be maintained.</i>	
--	--	--	--

		78. <i>An authority holding an enquiry of such a nature would ordinarily carry out exercises to find out as to whether the selection process was vitiated by fraud or such illegalities which would vitiate the entire selection process.</i> <i>The Committee was dealing with charges of aiding and abetting corruption on the part of the judicial officers any only some of them and, thus, it was necessary for it to apply its mind more seriously. The members of the Committee were not re-evaluating the answer scripts. The candidates were not before them. Their abilities were not being tested. The learned members of the Committee should have asked unto themselves the right question, mainly because the issue before them was different and distinct from an ordinary departmental enquiry. In any event, there was absolutely no reason why copies of the said reports could not have been supplied to the appellant.</i> Upon perusal of the aforesaid observations of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and having regard to the request made by the learned counsel appearing for both sides, this Court is of the view that the preliminary report and the subsequent report, to the extent available, may be furnished to the learned counsel appearing for the parties, subject to the reports being placed on record and without affecting the ongoing investigation or the receipt of the remaining forensic reports. Accordingly, the Registrar (Judicial) is directed to furnish Xerox copies of the preliminary report dated 29.06.2026 and the second report submitted today, i.e., 10.08.2026, to the learned counsel appearing for both sides,	
--	--	---	--

		if any application in that regard is filed by them. Post on 01.09.2026. klk <u>DR,J</u> <u>AGD,J</u>	
--	--	---	--