

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE No: Writ Petition No.10934 of 2026

PROCEEDINGS SHEET

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
01.	10.04.2026	<u>PSK,J & NNR,J</u> Counsel for the petitioner : Mr.K.Sudhakar Reddy Counsel for the respondent :Mr.N.Bhujanga Rao, learned DSGI The instant writ petition has been filed being aggrieved by the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad Bench while taking up O.A.No.381 of 2026 filed by the petitioner dated 07.04.2026. <i>Vide</i> the said order, the Central Administrative Tribunal has not granted an interim protection to the petitioner so far as ordering the respondents to grant extraordinary relief enabling him to join the super-speciality course i.e., DM (Neurology) where the petitioner has been allocated to Sanjay Gandhi Post Graduation Institute of Medical Science, Raibareli, Lucknow. The petitioner has been successful in getting admission in the said institute where the first round of counselling that has convened on 17.03.2026. However, on account of the order dated 30.03.2026	Transferred to i/o folder, before corrections, if any.

	passed by respondent No.2, the petitioner has been denied of granting No Objection Certificate so also granting of Extraordinary relief. It is pertinent at this juncture, to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court recently passed in somewhat similar circumstances i.e., in the case of <i>Dr.Rohit Kumar v. Secretary, Office of Lt.Governor of Delhi</i> in <i>C.A.No.2739 of 2021</i> arising out of <i>SLP(C) No.3824 of 2021</i> wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has encouraged granting of such extraordinary relief for super-specialty courses on the ground that ultimately the course which the candidate would pursue be also more beneficial so far as employer is concerned where this specialized candidate can be used for the benefit of the general public or the people associated with the respondents in this case. Given the said judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, <i>prima facie</i>, we are of the view that the order passed by the respondent No.2 refusing to grant extraordinary relief seems to be too harsh a decision and in any case is ultimately going to be detrimental to the respondents inasmuch as in the long run deprived of having super-specialized Doctor particularly in DM (Neurology) which is a very short	
--	---	--

	of course into this era. Moreover, we will not find <i>prima facie</i> any rule to be denying a candidate steadily for the second occasion. Moreover, from the documents available, it appears that the petitioner has been making correspondence with the respondents first of all seeking permission to appear in the NEET Examination, thereafter, seeking permission to appear for the counselling and later on also applying for grant of NOC and extraordinary relief. It is not a case where the petitioner has not made any correspondence with the respondents and has suddenly stood up claiming for the NOC and EOA. In view of the same, the Bench is inclined to direct respondent Nos.2 and 3 to reconsider the order dated 30.03.2026 so far as issuance of NOC and extraordinary relief is concerned. Considering the urgency in the matter, particularly when the second phase of counselling has only closed recently and the petitioner if he does not report for the course promptly the seat may be allotted to some other candidate which would be a life-time loss to the Department in the long run as well. Thus, we are fixing the matter again on 15.04.2026 under the caption 'fresh admission' by	
--	--	--

		which time, respondent Nos.2 and 3 should positively pass fresh orders so far as issuance of NOC and EOA are concerned. List this case on 15.04.2026 under the ‘fresh admission’ caption. <u>PSK,J</u> <u>NNR,J</u> <i>mrn</i>	
--	--	---	--