

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE No.: W.P.No.8611 of 2026

PROCEEDING SHEET

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	20.04.2026	<u>DR, J</u> The learned counsel for the petitioner mainly contended that the impugned order placing the petitioner under suspension vide order dated 16.03.2026 is unsustainable. It is submitted that a batch of writ petitions was filed questioning the appointment of the 2nd respondent as Director of Animal Husbandry, and a coordinate Bench of this Court, after considering the entire issue, passed an order dated 29.01.2026 declaring that the said appointment was not in accordance with the prescribed procedure and accordingly issued a writ of quo warranto. In such circumstances, the impugned suspension order is liable to be declared as being without jurisdiction. The learned counsel for the petitioner further contended that, as per the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, if an order of suspension is passed without jurisdiction, this Court is entitled to interfere with the same.	

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
		On the other hand, the learned Government Pleader sought short time to obtain instructions with regard to the writ of quo warranto issued by this Court in the above-referred judgment. List next week. DR, J klk	

SL. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE