



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

**[3460]**

WEDNESDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF JANUARY  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY  
WRIT PETITION NO: 24771/2025**

**Between:**

1. PAPPALA BHAVANI, , D/O SURINAIDU, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, R/O. C-1, MALYADA, NELIMARLA, VIZIANAGARAM, ANDHRA PRADESH - 535218.
2. ALLU GUMPASWAMY, , S/O LATE ALLU SUNKURU AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, R/O PARVATHIPURAM, CHAPPAVANIVALSA, THALLABURIDI, VIZIANAGARAM, AP - 535527.

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.
2. THE COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
3. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
4. THE ANDHRA PRADESH DISTRICT SELECTION COMMITTEE, (AP DSC) - 2025, REP. BY ITS CONVENOR/CHAIRMAN, O/O COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, AMARAVATI.

**...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 on the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in not considering the petitioners selection to the posts of School Assistants (SA) in the AP MEGA DSC- 2025 on the basis of merit-cum-roster, and instead giving precedence to the preferences exercised by the Petitioners at the time of notification and further issuing a PRESS RELEASE stating that the selection of candidates is based on their preferred options at the time of the notification despite the fact that separate application fee was collected for each post, separate exam was conducted for each post and

separate merit list was prepared for each post and the same is contrary to the guideline no.24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 that allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit cum roster, and vacancy position and in conflict with the settled proposition of law that merit cum roster is to be mandatorily followed in the public recruitment process and thereby ignoring the superior merit secured by the Petitioners in the School Assistant (SA) category, as blindfolded approach, illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and it is consequently prayed to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) AND Pradeep Jain v. Union of India (1984) 3 SCC 654) de hors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**IA NO: 1 OF 2025**

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 to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guidelines 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) & Pradeep Jain v. Union of India, (1984) 3 SCC 654) de hors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**IA NO: 2 OF 2025**

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 to vacate the interim order dated: 12.09.2025 in WP.NO.24771/2025 in the interest of justice and may be pleased to pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner(S):**

1. G V S KISHORE KUMAR

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1. GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

**WRIT PETITION NO: 25501/2025****Between:**

1. SIVARATHRI TRIVENI,, D/O SIVARATHRISRINIVASARAO, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, R/O. D.NO.1-4-146, RANGA COLONY, 2ND WARD, SATTENAPALLE MANDAL, SATTENAPALLE, GUNTUR, ANDHRA PRADESH-522403.

**...PETITIONER****AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.
2. THE COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
3. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
4. THE ANDHRA PRADESH DISTRICT SELECTION COMMITTEE, (AP DSC) - 2025, REP. BY ITS CONVENOR/CHAIRMAN, O/O COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, AMARAVATI.

**...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 on the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in publishing the final selection list of SA(NL) Physical Education and not considering the petitioner selection to the post of School Assistant (SA) Physical Education in the AP MEGA DSC-2025 on the basis of merit-cum-roster, but instead allotting the petitioner to Physical Education Teacher APTWRS i.e equivalent Secondary Grade Teacher (SGT) post solely on the basis of the preference order exercised at the time of application, despite the fact that separate application fee was collected for each post, separate exam was conducted for each post and separate merit list was prepared for each post and the same is contrary to the guideline no.24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 that allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit cum roster, and vacancy position and in conflict with the settled proposition of law that merit cum roster is to be mandatorily followed in the public recruitment process and thereby ignoring the superior merit secured by the Petitioner in the School Assistant (SA) NL Physical Education category, as blindfolded approach, illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and it is consequently prayed to direct the

Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioner for School Assistant post based on her merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) and Pradeep Jain v. Union of India (1984) 3 SCC 654) dehors the options preferred by the petitioner in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pas

**IA NO: 1 OF 2025**

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 to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioner for School Assistant post based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) MeetaSahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) & Pradeep Jain v. Union of India, (1984) 3 SCC 654) dehors the options preferred by the petitioner in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**

1.THOKA DEVA DEEPAK ANIRUDH YADAV

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1.GP FOR SERVICES II

**WRIT PETITION NO: 25744/2025**

**Between:**

- 1.K B RAVEENDRA KUMAR, S/O. K CHINNA NAGA LINGAMIAH, AGED -41 YEARS R/O. 3/635, G V P COLONY, TADIPATRI, ANANTHAPURAMU, AP-515411.
- 2.AREKANTI LAKSHMAN BABU, S/O. A DUBBANNA, AGED- 42 YEARS, R/O. 5-40-4, SC COLONY, KODUMUR, KALLAPARI, PULAKURTHY, KURNOOL, AP, 518462.

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**AND**

- 1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.
- 2.THE COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
- 3.THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
- 4.THE ANDHRA PRADESH DISTRICT SELECTION COMMITTEE

AP DSC 2025, REP. BY ITS CONVENOR/CHAIRMAN, O/O  
COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, AMARAVATI.

**...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 on the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in not considering the petitioners selection to the posts of Principals in the AP MEGA DSC-2025 on the basis of merit-cum- roster, and instead giving precedence to the preferences exercised by the Petitioners at the time of notification and further issuing a PRESS RELEASE stating that the selection of candidates is based on their preferred options at the time of the notification despite the fact that separate application fee was collected for each post, separate exam was conducted for each post and separate merit list was prepared for each post and the same is contrary to the guideline no.24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 that allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit cum roster, and vacancy position and in conflict with the settled proposition of law that merit cum roster is to be mandatorily followed in the public recruitment process and thereby ignoring the superior merit secured by the Petitioners in the Principal category, as blindfolded approach, illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and it is consequently prayed to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for Principal posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) and Pradeep Jain v. Union of India (1984) 3 SCC 654) dehors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**IA NO: 1 OF 2025**

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 to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for Principal posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) & Pradeep Jain v. Union of India, (1984) 3 SCC 654) dehors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner(S):**

1.G V S KISHORE KUMAR

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1.GP FOR SERVICES II

**WRIT PETITION NO: 25763/2025****Between:**

1. G FOUZIA BANU, C/O G SALUDDIN, AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, R/O H.NO.49/50A-87C-8, LAKSHMI NAGAR, KALLUR MANDAL, KURNOOL DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 518002.
2. CHAKKA SWATHI, , C/O. BATHA DHARMA RAO, AGED.29 YEARS, R/O. 1-51, BATNA VEEDHI, CHINNA LANKAM LABHAM, SRIKAKULAM, ANDHRA PRADESH,516217.
3. CHIRASANI PEDDAIAH,, S/O. CHIRASANI BASI REDDY, AGED.39 YEARS, R/O. 1/27, PATHA RAMAPURAM, KALASAPADU, CUDDAPAH, ANDHRA PRADESH,516217.
4. PAGIDI NARESH BABU,, S/O PAGIDI NAGESWARA RAO AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS, R/O H.NO. 4/105, GUDDIVERAIAGH SATHRAM, NADYALAMPET POST, MYDUKURU, CUDDAPAH DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 516172.
5. C.BALA SARASWATHI, C/O S KOTESWARAIAH AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, R/O 1-1, GUDALAVARI PALEM, VARADAIAHPALEM, KALATHURU, TALARIVETTU, CHITTOOR DISTRICT-517541.
6. GUGULOTHU SANKAR NAIK, C/O GAGULOTHU SRINU, AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS, R/O 2-79, MACHINENIPALEM, VATSAVAI MANDAL, KRISHNA DISTRICT-521402.
7. DUGGIRALA KRISHNA, S/O NAGESWARA RAO, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, R/O 1-127/1, S T COLONY, VAVILALA TIRUVURU MANDALAM, KRISHNA DISTRICT-521325.
8. PAVAN KUMAR KOTHALA, S/O. LATE TATA AGED ABOUT. 39 YEARS, R/O. 3-29, PATHAVALSA POST KOTAPADU VISAKHAPATNAM, AP,531034.
9. ALAMANDA SOWJANYA, D/O ALAMANDA VENKATA RAMANA, AGED ABOUT. 36 YEARS, R/O. R/O. 1-1, KOTHAMALLAMPETA, VISAKHAPATNAM, AP,531084.
- 10.KANCHIMIREDDY ARUNA KUMARI,, D/O ANKIREDDY, AGED ABOUT. 29 YEARS, R/O. 1-33, B KOTTALA PALLI, KONDAPURAM, CUDAPAH, AP,516444.
- 11.VAASAM SWAMY, S/O VASAM SAMBHA MURTHY, AGED ABOUT. 27 YEARS, R/O.0.00, KOYYURU MANDALAM

ADAKULA VISAKHAPATNAM 531115.

12.MANVI HANUMANTHA, S/O MANVI KALINGAPPA, AGED ABOUT. 28 YEARS, R/O.3-53, B C COLONY, PEDDA HARIVANAM, KURNOOL-518308.

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**AND**

- 1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.
- 2.THE COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
- 3.THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
- 4.THE ANDHRA PRADESH DISTRICT SELECTION COMMITTEE AP DSC 2025, REP. BY ITS CONVENOR/CHAIRMAN, O/O COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, AMARAVATI.

**...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 on the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in not considering the petitioners selection to the posts of School Assistants (SA) in the AP MEGA DSC-2025 on the basis of merit-cum-roster, and instead giving precedence to the preferences exercised by the Petitioners at the time of notification and further issuing a PRESS RELEASE stating that the selection of candidates is based on their preferred options at the time of the notification despite the fact that separate application fee was collected for each post, separate exam was conducted for each post and separate merit list was prepared for each post and the same is contrary to the guideline no.24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 that allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit cum roster, and vacancy position and in conflict with the settled proposition of law that merit cum roster is to be mandatorily followed in the public recruitment process and thereby ignoring the superior merit secured by the Petitioners in the School Assistant (SA) category, as blindfolded approach, illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and it is consequently prayed to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable

Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) and Pradeep Jain v. Union of India (1984) 3 SCC 654) dehors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**IA NO: 1 OF 2025**

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 to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) & Pradeep Jain v. Union of India, (1984) 3 SCC 654) dehors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner(S):**

1. G V S KISHORE KUMAR

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1. GP FOR SERVICES II

**WRIT PETITION NO: 26312/2025**

**Between:**

1. VARRI SAI SRAVANTHI, D/O VARRI VENKATA SATYA SANYASI NAIDU, AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, R/O. 5-20-8, ANJANEYASWAMI TEMPLE STREET, TUNI MANDAL, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 533401.
2. VISWANADHAPALLI SURESH,, S/O NARAYANA RAO, AGED ABOUT 41 YEARS, R/O.2-610, MURTHY MAHAL ROAD AVANIGADDA, KRISHNA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 521121.
3. CHODIGINJALA NAGABHUSHANA RAO,, S/O CHODIGINJALA SIMHACHALAM. AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS, R/O. SUDIGAM CHINNA STREET, PARVATHIPURAM, VIZIANAGARAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 535527.
4. BHEESETTI NAVI CHANDRIKA,, C/O KONATHALA LEELA PRASAD AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, R/O. 2-91, GAJAPATHINAGARAM, CHODAVARAM, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 531023.
5. AMARESU SRINIVASA RAO, S/O A.MUTYALU, AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS, R/O. 2-47A, MARTUR KOLAPUDI, PRAKASAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 523261.

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.
2. THE COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
3. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
4. THE ANDHRA PRADESH DISTRICT SELECTION COMMITTEE AP DSC 2025, REP. BY ITS CONVENOR/CHAIRMAN, O/O COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, AMARAVATI.

**...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 issue a Writ, order or direction, more particularly one on the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in not considering the petitioners selection to the posts of School Assistants (SA) in the AP MEGA DSC-2025 on the basis of merit-cum-roster, and instead giving precedence to the preferences exercised by the Petitioners at the time of notification and further issuing a PRESS RELEASE stating that the selection of candidates is based on their preferred options at the time of the notification despite the fact that separate application fee was collected for each post, separate exam was conducted for each post and separate merit list was prepared for each post and the same is contrary to the guideline no.24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 that allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit cum roster, and vacancy position and in conflict with the settled proposition of law that merit cum roster is to be mandatorily followed in the public recruitment process and thereby ignoring the superior merit secured by the Petitioners in the School Assistant (SA) category, as blindfolded approach, illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and it is consequently prayed to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) and Pradeep Jain v. Union of India (1984) 3 see 654) de hors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**IA NO: 1 OF 2025**

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 to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) & Pradeep Jain v. Union of India, (1984) 3 SCC 654) de hors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner(S):**

1. G V S KISHORE KUMAR

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1. GP FOR SERVICES II

**WRIT PETITION NO: 26323/2025**

**Between:**

1. KURUVA VEERESH, S/O RANGAIAH, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, R/O. 1-13, MACHAPURAM DEVANAKONDA, KURNOOL DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 518464.
2. K. MADHUSUDHANA RAO, S/O K. NARASINGARAO, AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS, R/O. 3-2, DHARMAVARAM, MEDAPURAM, ANANTAPUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 515651.
3. DHANEDI SUREKHA,, D/O DHANEDI VIJAYA BHASKAR RAO AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, R/O. 9-7-454, YELESWARAM, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 533429.
4. NANDYALA MOUNIKA,, C/O KOLLI INDRASEN REDDY AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS, R/O. 1-18A, CHENNUR, SIRVEL, KURNOOL DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 518583.
5. MANCHELA DURGA GANESH,, S/O MANCHELA NAGESWARAO AGED ABOUT 39 YEARS, R/O. 3-203/1, SARADHANAGAR, NARSIPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 531116.
6. NALLI ARUNA, C/O GOGU RAMAIAH, AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS, R/O. 1-5-36, LAKSHMI PALEM GOPAVARAM MANDLAM, CUDAPPA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 515651.
7. JARAPALA DURGA PRASAD,, S/O JARAPALA BHAVA NAIK AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS, R/O. 15-20, HANUMAPURAM, MARRIPALEM, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 522614.

8. POTTI ROJA, W/O B. PAPA RAO AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS, R/O. 2-16, THOTAUOORU VILLAGE, SIRIMAMIDI PANCHAYATI, SOMPETA MANDAL, SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 532263.
9. JINAGAM GEETHA,, D/O SANKAR RAO, AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS, R/O. 14-41, KANCHANA STREET, RAJAM, SRIKAKULAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 532127.
10. PANDRANA BEBI,, C/O ADARI SANNNI BABU, AGED ABOUT 34 YEARS, R/O. 1-161, INDIRAMMA COLONY, MUNAGAPAKA, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 531033.

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**AND**

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.
2. THE COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
3. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
4. THE ANDHRA PRADESH DISTRICT SELECTION COMMITTEE AP DSC 2025, REP. BY ITS CONVENOR/CHAIRMAN, O/O COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, AMARAVATI.

**...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 on the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in not considering the petitioners selection to the posts of School Assistants (SA) in the AP MEGA DSC-2025 on the basis of merit-cum-roster, and instead giving precedence to the preferences exercised by the Petitioners at the time of notification and further issuing a PRESS RELEASE stating that the selection of candidates is based on their preferred options at the time of the notification despite the fact that separate application fee was collected for each post, separate exam was conducted for each post and separate merit list was prepared for each post and the same is contrary to the guideline no.24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 that allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit cum roster, and vacancy position and in conflict with the settled proposition of law that merit cum roster is to be mandatorily followed in the public recruitment process and thereby ignoring the superior merit secured by the Petitioners in the School

Assistant (SA) category, as blindfolded approach, illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and it is consequently prayed to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) and Pradeep Jain v. Union of India (1984) 3 see 654) de hors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**IA NO: 1 OF 2025**

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 to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) & Pradeep Jain v. Union of India, (1984) 3 see 654) de hors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner(S):**

1.G V S KISHORE KUMAR

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1.GP FOR SERVICES II

**WRIT PETITION NO: 26700/2025**

**Between:**

- 1.PUNDUKURA SHIVA REDDY, S/O.PUNDUKURA NARAHARI REDDY AGED 38 YEARS, R/O. DOOR NO.2/149, BANGARAMAVVA STREET, RACHUMAARI MANTRALAYAM, KURNOOL DISTRICT-518319.
- 2.SREENIVASULU DERANGI, S/O.DERANGI VENKATA RAMANA, R/O.D.NO.5-119 NEAR VENKATESWARA TEMPLE, KADAPA DISTRICT,516349.

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**AND**

- 1.THE STATE OF AP, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.
- 2.THE COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION,

GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.

3. THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.

4. THE ANDHRA PRADESH DISTRICT SELECTION COMMITTEE, (AP DSC) - 2025, REP. BY ITS CONVENOR/CHAIRMAN, O/O COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, AMARAVATI.

**...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 issue a Writ, order or direction, more particularly one on the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in not considering the petitioners selection to the posts of Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT) in the AP MEGA DSC-2025 on the basis of merit-cum-roster, and instead giving precedence to the preferences exercised by the Petitioners at the time of notification and further issuing a PRESS RELEASE stating that the selection of candidates is based on their preferred options at the time of the notification despite the fact that separate application fee was collected for each post, separate exam was conducted for each post and separate merit list was prepared for each post and the same is contrary to the guideline no.24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 that allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit cum roster, and vacancy position and in conflict with the settled proposition of law that merit cum roster is to be mandatorily followed in the public recruitment process and thereby ignoring the superior merit secured by the Petitioners in the Trained Graduate Teacher(TGT) category, as blindfolded approach, illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and it is consequently prayed to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioner for Trained Graduate Teacher(TGT) post based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) and Pradeep Jain v. Union of India (1984) 3 SCC 654) de hors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**IA NO: 1 OF 2025**

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 to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for

Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT) posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) & Pradeep Jain v. Union of India, (1984) 3 SCC 654) de hors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner(S):**

1.G V S KISHORE KUMAR

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1.GP FOR SERVICES II

**WRIT PETITION NO: 27843/2025**

**Between:**

- 1.M MOHAN,, S/O M GAJENDRAN AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS, R/O D.NO.6-119, NAGARI CHITTOOR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 517590.
- 2.R SAILAJA,, D/O. R VENKATA SREENIVASULU, AGED 31 YEARS, R/O.DOOR NO QUARTER 2, APSWR SCHOOL, MODEL SCHOOL ROAD KOTIA MARKET YARD, DHONE, KURNOOL DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH,518222.
- 3.SMS NIRANJANI,, D/O. MEKALA SUBRAMANYAM AGED 43 YEARS, R/O. 14-99, SHOP STREET, PUTTUR, CHITTOOR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH,517583.
- 4.G R SAILAJA,, D/O G RAMA MOORTHY, AGED ABOUT 37 YEARS, R/O D.NO.5-70/1, SREEPATHI RAO STREET, OLDPET, PALAMANER, CHITTOOR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH - 517408.
- 5.KHANDAVALLI VAMSI KRISHNA, S/O.SATYA PRASAD AGED 40 YEARS, R/O. DOOR NO.2-33, RAVI CHETTU VEEDHI, MAREDUBAKA, MANDAPETA, EAST GODAVARI DISTRICT,533308.

**...PETITIONER(S)**

**AND**

- 1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.
- 2.THE COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
- 3.THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
- 4.THE ANDHRA PRADESH DISTRICT SELECTION COMMITTEE AP DSC 2025, REP. BY ITS CONVENOR/CHAIRMAN, O/O

COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, AMARAVATI.

**...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 on the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in not considering the petitioners selection to the posts of School Assistants (SA) in the AP MEGA DSC-2025 on the basis of merit-cum- roster, and instead giving precedence to the preferences exercised by the Petitioners at the time of notification and further issuing a PRESS RELEASE stating that the selection of candidates is based on their preferred options at the time of the notification despite the fact that separate application fee was collected for each post, separate exam was conducted for each post and separate merit list was prepared for each post and the same is contrary to the guideline no.24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 that allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit cum roster, and vacancy position and in conflict with the settled proposition of law that merit cum roster is to be mandatorily followed in the public recruitment process and thereby ignoring the superior merit secured by the Petitioners in the School Assistant (SA) category, as blindfolded approach, illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and it is consequently prayed to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) and Pradeep Jain v. Union of India (1984) 3 SCC 654) dehors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice

**IA NO: 1 OF 2025**

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 to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) & Pradeep Jain v. Union of India, (1984) 3 SCC 654) dehors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice

**Counsel for the Petitioner(S):**

1.G V S KISHORE KUMAR

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1.GP FOR SERVICES II

**WRIT PETITION NO: 28655/2025****Between:**

- 1.VENKATA SIVA REDDY Y, S/O. VENKATA LINGA REDDY Y, AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS, R/O. D.NO 2-106A SEETHARAMAPURAN, NANDIPALLE, MAHANADI, KURNOOL DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 518502.
- 2.SHAIK SAMEER BASHA,, S/O. SHAIK SHAJAHAN, AGED ABOUT 33 YEARS, R/O D.NO V3/756-3, OPPOSITE GAUTAM WATER, ARAVINDA ASHRAMAM PRODDATUR(URBAN), KADAPA DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 521121.
- 3.P POTHAN PRASAD,, S/O. P CHENGAL RAYADU, AGED ABOUT 40 YEARS, R/O. D.NO9/448, OPP. APSRTC BUS STAND, RAJAMPET, KADAPA DISTRICT ANDHRA PRADESH- 516115.
- 4.BUDALA SANTHI,, D/O. BUDALA THIRUPALU, AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS, R/O. D.NO.2-61, KOVILA MPADU, CHANDRASEKARAPURAM, PRAKASAM DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 523112.
- 5.PABBULETI PRASAD, S/O PABBULETI VENKATESWARLU, AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS, R/O. D.NO 14-73, NEAR MOSQUE PONNEKALLU, TADIKONDA, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 522018.
- 6.JANAVATH KALAVATHI BAI, D/O. J AKASH NAIK, AGED ABOUT 32 YEARS, R/O. D.NO1-179, G THANDA, GORUKALLU, PANYAM, KURNOOL DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH- 518511.

**...PETITIONER(S)****AND**

- 1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT, VELAGAPUDI, AMARAVATI.
- 2.THE COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
- 3.THE DIRECTOR OF SCHOOL EDUCATION, GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, AMARAVATI.
- 4.THE ANDHRA PRADESH DISTRICT SELECTION COMMITTEE, (AP DSC) - 2025 REP. BY ITS CONVENOR/CHAIRMAN, O/O COMMISSIONER OF SCHOOL

EDUCATION, AMARAVATI.

**...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 on the nature of writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondents in not considering the petitioners selection to the posts of School Assistants SA in the AP MEGA DSC 2025 on the basis of merit-cum- roster, and instead giving precedence to the preferences exercised by the Petitioners at the time of notification and further issuing a PRESS RELEASE stating that the selection of candidates is based on their preferred options at the time of the notification despite the fact that separate application fee collected for each post, separate exam was conducted for each post and separate merit list was prepared for each post and the same is contrary to the guideline no.24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 that allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit cum roster, and vacancy position and in conflict with the settled proposition of law that merit cum roster is to be mandatorily followed in the public recruitment process and was thereby ignoring the superior merit secured by the Petitioners in the School Assistant (SA) category, as blindfolded approach, illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India, and it is consequently prayed to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) and Pradeep Jain v. Union of India (1984) 3 SCC 654) dehors the options preferred by the petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**IA NO: 1 OF 2025**

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 to direct the Respondents, more particularly respondent no.4 to consider the case of petitioners for School Assistant posts based on their merit cum roster in terms of guideline 24 clause (d) of the notification dt.20.04.2025 and in terms of the law laid down by the Honourable Apex court in Dr. (Major) Meeta Sahai v. State of Bihar, (2019) 20 SCC 17) & Pradeep Jain v. Union of India, (1984) 3 SCC 654) dehors the options preferred by the

petitioners in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice and pass

**Counsel for the Petitioner(S):**

1.G V S KISHORE KUMAR

**Counsel for the Respondent(S):**

1.GP FOR SERVICES II

**HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY**

**W.P.Nos.24771, 25501, 25744, 25763, 26312, 26323, 26700,  
27843 and 28655 of 2025**

**COMMON ORDER:**

These writ petitions are filed questioning the action of the Respondents in not considering the case of the Petitioners for selection to the posts of School Assistants (SA) in the A.P.MEGA DSC-2025 on the basis of merit-cum-roster instead of preferences exercised under Rule 10 of the *A.P.Teacher Recruitment Test (AP TRT) Rules for the posts of School Assistant (SA), Secondary Grade Teachers (SGT), Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT-Special education in Special Schools), Secondary Grade Teachers (SGT-Special education in Special Schools) and Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT), Physical Education Teachers (PETs) scheme of Selection Rules, 2025 (for short 'the AP TRT Rules. 2025')*.

2. Learned counsel for the Petitioners as well as learned Government Pleader for School Education would submit that the issue involved in these Writ Petitions is squarely covered by the order dated 29.12.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.Nos.23243 and 23487 of 2025 and requested to pass a similar order in these Writ Petitions also.

3. In view of the same, these Writ Petitions are also disposed of in terms of the order, dated 29.12.2025 passed by this Court in

W.P.Nos.23243 and 23487 of 2025 and the Petitioners are extended similar reliefs. There shall be no order as to costs.

4. Registry is directed to attach the copy of the order, dated 29.12.2025 passed by this Court in W.P.Nos.23243 and 23487 of 2025 to this order.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

---

**NYAPATHY VIJAY, J**

Date: 07.01.2026

chs

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NYAPATHY VIJAY**

90

**WRIT PETITION NOS: 24771, 25501, 25744, 25763, 26312, 26323,  
26700, 27843 and 28655 of 2025**

**Dt. 07.01.2026**

chs