

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD**

FRIDAY, THE NINTH DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

:PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE PULLA KARTHIK

WRIT PETITION NO: 38968 OF 2025

Between:

T. Dhangopal Rao, S/o. T.Y. Rao

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Telangana, rep. by its Chief Secretary, GAD, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar
Telangana State Secretariat, Hyderabad
2. The Union of India, rep by its Secretary. Home Affairs, North Block,
Chanikyapuri, New Delhi-110001
3. Union Public Service Commission, Rep by its Secretary Dholpur House
Shahjahan Road New Delhi 110068.
4. Sri. B. Shivadhar Reddy, IPS, Director General of Police (Coordination) -cum
Director General of Police, HoPF, (FAC),, O/o. The Director General of Police,
Telangana, Saifabad, Hyderabad.

...Respondents

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 so particularly one in the nature of Writ of Quo Warranto thereby quashing of impugned appointment order of R4 vide **G.O.Rt.No.1339 dated 26.09.2025** issued by R1 as it is against the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of Prakash Singh Vs. Union of India vide Order dated **03-07-2018 in 1.A.No.25307 of 2018 in WP(C).No.310 of 1996** wherein it was ruled as:- ***(d) None of the States shall ever conceive of the idea of appointing any person on the post of Director General of Police on acting basis for there is no concept of acting Director General of Police as per the decision in Prakash Singh's case(supra);*** and to issue Writ of Mandamus to R1 to R3 to forthwith follow the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the matter of Prakash Singh Vs. Union of India vide Order dated **03-07-2018 in I.A.No.25307 of 2018 in WP(C)No.310 of 1996** and appoint a permanent Director General of Police (HoPF) for the State of Telangana within a week and quash the Colourable Legislation i.e."The Telangana Police (Selection and appointment of DGP (HoPF) Act, 2018" as it runs counter to

the direction (g) in Order dated **03-07-2018** in **I.A.No.25307 of 2018** in **WP(C).No.310 of 1996**;

IA NO: 4 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 suspend operation of The Telangana Police (Selection and appointment of DGP (HoPF) Act, 2018, pending disposal of WP No. 38968 of 2025, on the file of the High Court.

IA NO: 5 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 suspend the operation of the impugned appointment order vide G.O.Rt.No.1339 dated 26.09.2025, pending disposal of WP No. 38968 of 2025, on the file of the High Court.

The Petition coming on for hearing and upon perusing the petition and affidavit filed herein and the order of the High Court dated 24.12.2025 made herein and upon hearing the arguments of Sri T. Dhangopal Rao, Petitioner as Party-in-Person, Advocate General, for the Respondent No.1, Sri N.Bhujanga Rao, Deputy Solicitor General of India, for the Respondent No.2 and Sri Ajay Kumar Kulkarni, Standing Counsel for UPSC, for the Respondent No.3

The Court made the following: ORDER

When the matter came up for hearing on 24.12.2025, Sri Ajay Kumar Kulkarni, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.3, produced a copy of the e-mail instructions furnished by respondent No.3, which reads as follows:

"The Govt. of Telangana vide letter dated 25.04.2025 submitted the proposal for convening the Empanelment Committee Meeting (ECM) for appointment to the post of DGP(HoPF) of Telangana. The Commission vide letter dated 20.05.2025 requested the State Govt. to furnish deficient information for processing the proposal for convening of the ECM. In response, the Govt. of Telangana vide letter dated 18.06.2025 furnished the requisite information/ documents. As the reply submitted by the State Govt. was still incomplete, the deficiency letter was again issued by the Commission vide letter dated 21.07.2025. Further reminders dated 29.08.2025 and 24.10.2025 were also issued to the State Govt. to expedite their response. Till date, no further response and reply has been received from the Govt. of Telangana."

In the above circumstances and owing to the inaction on the part of respondent No.1, despite consistent communications from respondent No.3 to complete the procedure, this Court was inclined to pass the following interim order on 24.12.2025:

"In view of the above, respondent No.1-Chief Secretary, General Administration Department, State of Telangana, is directed to forthwith sent the proposals comprising the list of officers eligible for the cadre of Director General of Police, by continuing the process already initiated, strictly in compliance with the specific directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 03.07.2018 passed in I.A. No.25307 of 2018 in Prakash Singh (supra). The entire process shall be completed within a period of two (2) weeks from today, and compliance be reported on the next date of hearing."

Today, when the matter came up for reporting compliance, the learned Advocate General, appearing on behalf of respondent No.1, submits that in compliance with the interim order of this Court dated 24.12.2025, and the reminders of respondent No.3 dated 20.05.2025, 18.06.2025, 21.07.2025, 29.08.2025 and 24.10.2025, respondent No.1 has sent the deficient documents to respondent No.3 vide letter dated 31.12.2025, by continuing the process already initiated on 25.04.2025. However, instead of continuing the process in pursuance of the interim order of this Court, vide letter dated 01.01.2026, respondent No.3 has returned the proposals sent by respondent No.1 with an advice to seek appropriate clarification/direction from the Hon'ble Apex Court, by citing delay as the sole reason, and reliance was placed upon the opinion rendered by the learned Attorney General of India with respect to the State of West Bengal. It is submitted that the said opinion was rendered only in respect of the circumstances in the State of West Bengal, whereas, in the instant case, respondent No.3 had sought for the deficient documents at multiple occasions, and therefore, the interim order dated 24.12.2025 was passed directing the respondents to complete the process, already initiated, within two weeks. As such, it is apparent that the facts in both the cases are different. Therefore, the letter addressed by respondent No.3 dated 01.01.2026, is not only contrary to the interim

order of this Court dated 24.12.2025, but also contrary to its own submissions before this Court.

On the other hand, learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.3, on instructions, submits that the proposals have been sent belatedly. Hence, respondent No.3 has returned the proposals requesting the State to obtain a clarification from the Hon'ble Apex Court.

Having regard to the above made submissions and upon perusal of the material on record, it is evident that in compliance with the interim order of this Court dated 24.12.2025, respondent No.1 forwarded the deficient documents vide letter dated 31.12.2025, which were admittedly returned by respondent No.3 vide letter dated 01.01.2026, citing delay as the reason. However, it is relevant to note that only upon considering the submissions made learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.3 and their written instructions dated 23.12.2025, that despite repeated communications/reminders dated 20.05.2025, 18.06.2025, 21.07.2025, 29.08.2025 and 24.10.2025, respondent No.1 failed to forward the proposals and relevant deficient information to respondent No.3, this Court was inclined to pass the interim order dated 24.12.2025, directing the respondents to complete the entire process within two weeks. Hence, respondent No.3 ought not to have approbated and reprobated, by citing their repeated requests and in returning the proposals, without any reference to the interim order of this Court dated 24.12.2025 and the letter addressed by respondent No.1 dated 31.12.2025, especially on the ground of delay, which is an unknown procedure within the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Prakash Singh v. Union of India* [(2006) 8 SCC 1]. Therefore, the letter addressed by respondent No.3 dated 01.01.2026 is contrary to the interim order dated 24.12.2025.

During the course of hearing, it is brought to the notice of this Court that the State of Andhra Pradesh had also sent proposals for appointment of its Director General of Police in the year 2025, which is first such proposal sent since the bifurcation in the year 2014, and that despite a lapse of (11) years, no objection on the aspect of delay was raised, and an

Empanelment Committee Meeting was convened on 30.04.2025, whereafter, the entire process of sending the panel of three officers to the State of Andhra Pradesh was completed. In pursuance thereof, the Director General of Police was appointed vide G.O.Rt.No.1025 dated 26.05.2025.

Further, it has also been brought to the notice of this Court that when similar belated proposals were sent by the State of Tamil Nadu, the Hon'ble Apex Court passed orders dated 08.09.2025 in the Contempt Petition

(Diary No.49640 of 2025) filed in Henri Tiphagne v. N. Muruganandam, IAS & another, directing the Commission to consider the proposals sent by the State of Tamil Nadu.

In the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and in continuation with the earlier order dated 24.12.2025, the respondents, more particularly, respondent No.3 is directed to complete the entire process of selection of the Director General of Police (Head of Police Force) for the State of Telangana, as per the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Apex Court order dated 03.07.2018 passed in I.A. No.25307 of 2018 in Prakash Singh (supra), by continuing the process initiated by respondent No.1 vide letter dated 31.12.2025, in pursuance of the earlier interim order dated 24.12.2025, without reference to the letter addressed by respondent No.3 dated 01.01.2026. The entire exercised shall be completed as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of four (04) weeks from today, and compliance be reported on the next date of hearing.

Post this matter on 05.02.2026, for reporting compliance.

//TRUE COPY//

**SD/- A.H.S. GOWRI SHANKAR
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**


SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. The Chief Secretary, General Administration Department, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar
Telangana State Secretariat, Hyderabad
2. The Secretary, Union of India, Home Affairs, North Block, Chanakyapuri, New
Delhi-110001
3. The Secretary, Union Public Service Commission, Dholpur House Shahjahan
Road New Delhi 110068.
4. Sri. B. Shivadhar Reddy, IPS, Director General of Police (Coordination) -cum
Director General of Police, HoPF, (FAC), O/o. The Director General of Police,
Telangana, Saifabad, Hyderabad. (**Addresses 1 to 5 by SPAD**)
5. One CC to Sri. T. Dhangopal Rao, Party-in-Person [OPIIC]
6. Two CCs to GP For General Administration, High Court at Hyderabad. [OUT]
7. Two CCs to Advocate General, High Court at Hyderabad. [OUT]
8. Two CCs to Sri N. Bhujanga Rao, Deputy Solicitor General of India, High Court
at Hyderabad. [OUT]
9. One spare copy

SP

HIGH COURT

PK,J

DATED:09.01.2026

NOTE: POST THIS MATTER ON 05.02.2026, FOR REPORTING COMPLIANCE.

ORDER



WP.No.38968 of 2025

DIRECTION