

**WRIT PETITION NO: 25257 of 2025**

Muraharirao Komal Kumar,

...Petitioner

Vs.

the High Court of Andhra Pradesh

...Respondent

Advocate for Petitioner:

Mr. Vedula Venkata Ramana, Senior
Counsel appearing vice M/S
Bharadwaj Associates

Advocate for Respondent:

Mr. G. Vivekanand

**CORAM : THE CHIEF JUSTICE LISA GILL
SRI JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA****DATE : 17th June 2026****LISA GILL, CJ:**

Prayer in writ petition reads as under:

“..to issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ declaring that the action of the respondent in not including the name/candidature/hall ticket number of the petitioner i.e., 202502549 in the list of candidates qualified in the screening test held on 13.07.2025 for the purpose of appearing and participating in the written test to be conducted in the month of October, 2025 for recruitment to the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) as per recruitment notification No 05/2025 RC, dated 14.02.2025, despite the fact that the petitioner has secured higher marks (61.29%) than the qualifying marks of 40% (as per clause VI(a) of the recruitment notification) is arbitrary and illegal and direct the respondent to reckon the petitioner as the candidate qualified in the screening test for appearing in the written test to be conducted in the month of October, 2025 vide Hall Ticket No. 202502549 and resultantly allow the petitioner to participate and succeed in the recruitment process for appointment as Civil Judge (Junior Division) in the said recruitment notification and grant..”

2. It is submitted that writ petitioner, being fully eligible for post of Junior Civil Judge at the High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amaravati, applied for the same, pursuant to issuance of notification dated 14.02.2025. Writ petitioner participated in screening test conducted on 13.07.2025 and secured 61.29 marks, which is higher than minimum qualifying marks. Grievance raised is that writ petitioner was not called for written test despite having secured qualifying marks.

3. Learned Senior Counsel for writ petitioner vehemently argued that surprisingly instead of 400 candidates being called for written test in view of clause VI(a) of recruitment notification, which provides for shortlisted candidates in ratio of 1:10 to be called, 469 candidates were called and no reason whatsoever for not calling writ petitioner for written test was ever communicated.

4. Action of respondent is thus patently illegal and arbitrary, as petitioner should have been called upon to participate in written test for post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) and continue participation in further proceedings. It is thus prayed that this writ petition be allowed as prayed for.

5. Counter-affidavit on behalf of respondent has been filed. Learned counsel for respondent, while opposing the averments raised on behalf of writ petitioner, submits that recruitment process has been carried out in strict

adherence to the applicable rules and provisions. It is submitted that written examination was conducted on 11.10.2025 and 12.10.2025, with viva voce being conducted thereafter and result declared on 02.04.2026. He submits that necessary communication has also been addressed to Government on 10.04.2026 for issuance of appropriate orders.

6. It is submitted that merely because writ petitioner secured qualifying marks of over 40% in screening test does not automatically entitle him for participation in written examination. It is further explained that last shortlisted candidate, who was called for written examination in ratio of 1:10 of available vacancies, had secured 82.80 marks.

7. In respect to 469 candidates being called/shortlisted for written examination, learned counsel for respondent explains that insofar as writ petitioner is concerned, he belongs to BC-D category and two posts were notified for this category. Hence 20 candidates had to be shortlisted for written examination in descending order of merit under BC-D category and 20th candidate had secured 82.80 marks. However, four other candidates had also secured the same marks i.e., 82.80. Therefore, they too had to be called for written examination.

8. Similarly, in other categories, marks as secured by last candidate called had been secured by other candidates as well, due to which 469 candidates

had to be called instead of 400. Learned counsel for respondent further submits that selection process is now complete. It is thus prayed that this writ petition be dismissed being devoid of any merit.

9. We have heard learned counsel for parties and have perused file with their able assistance.

10. Admittedly, writ petitioner applied for appointment to post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) pursuant to notification, dated 14.02.2025. He participated in screening test conducted on 13.07.2025 and secured 61.29 marks.

11. Rule 6 of Andhra Pradesh State Judicial (Service & Cadre) Rules, 2007, provides for methodology for conducting examination, selection process, etc. Screening test for purpose of short-listing candidates and calling upon them in ratio of 1:10 of available vacancies is provided. Qualifying marks of 40% have been prescribed. Rule 6(d) reads as under:

“(d) For the purpose of short listing the candidates, who will be applying for the post of District Judge (Entry Level) by direct recruitment and Accelerated Recruitment by Transfer and for the post of Civil Judge, the High Court may, if necessary hold a screening test comprising of multiple choice objective type questions, on OMR Technology basis, and call upon the candidates in the ratio of 1:10 of the available vacancies, who have secured 40% and above marks in the Screening Test for a written examination.

Provided that if there are more than one candidate who have secured identical marks in the screening test, all such candidates shall be called for the written examination.”

12. It is specifically provided that in case more than one candidate have secured identical marks in screening test, all such candidates shall be called for written examination. In the present case, it is borne out from the record which was produced before us during course of hearing, that writ petitioner secured 61.29 marks, whereas last shortlisted candidate in that category secured 82.80 marks. Four other candidates also secured 82.80 marks. Therefore, 24 candidates in said category were called for written test.

13. We have also perused the record in this regard in view of submission made by learned counsel for petitioner that 469 candidates have been incorrectly called instead of 400, thereby lending prejudice to petitioner. It is apparent that number of candidates called for written test swelled to 469 instead of 400 because of identical marks being secured by candidates.

14. It is specifically stated in the counter that 4,558 candidates had appeared for screening test, 3,463 had secured qualifying 40% and above marks and number of candidates who secured 61.29 and above were 1,640.

15. Having heard learned counsel for parties, perusing the file as well as record produced before us, we are satisfied that there is no illegality or arbitrariness in not calling upon writ petitioner to take written examination. He has secured much less marks than the last shortlisted candidate(s), therefore, was not entitled to be called for written examination.

16. Keeping in view facts and circumstances as narrated above, we do not find any ground to cause interference in this writ petition. Same is dismissed being devoid of any merit. No costs.

Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

LISA GILL, CJ

NINALA JAYASURYA, J

akn

**HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE LISA GILL, CHIEF JUSTICE
&
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NINALA JAYASURYA**

Writ Petition No: 25257 of 2025

DATE : 17.06.2026

AKN