

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

**MAIN CASE No: W.A.Nos.1303, 1248, 1270, 1273, 1282, 1314
and 1332 of 2025**

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
2.	27.11.2025	<u>HCJ (AKrS,J) & GMM,J</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2025 in W.A.No.1248 of 2025;</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2025 in W.A.No.1270 of 2025;</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2025 in W.A.No.1273 of 2025;</u> <u>and</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2025 in W.A.No.1332 of 2025</u> Mr. G.Vidya Sagar, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Sai Prasen Gundavaram, learned counsel appears for the appellants in W.A.Nos.1248 of 2025. Mr. S.Rahul Reddy, learned Special Government Pleader attached to the office of learned Additional Advocate General, appears for the appellants in W.A.No.1303 of 2025, respondent Nos.1 and 2 in W.A.No.1248 of 2025, respondent No.2 in W.A.Nos.1273 and 1332 of 2025 and respondent Nos.2 and 3 in W.A.No.1270 of 2025. Mr. Baglekar Akash Kumar, learned counsel appears for the appellants in W.A.Nos.1270, 1273 and 1332 of 2025. Mr. E.Madan Mohan Rao, learned	

		Senior Counsel representing Mr. Kongara Raj Kumar, learned counsel for respondent Nos.5 to 11/writ petitioners in W.A.No.1248 of 2025. Mr. B.Chandra Shekhar, learned Standing Counsel for Sports Authority of Telangana State appears for respondent No.4 in W.A.Nos.1248 and 1332 of 2025 and respondent No.5 in W.A.No.1270 of 2025. Mr. Allika Suresh, learned counsel for respondent No.1 in W.A.No.1332 of 2025. Mr. P.S.Rajasekhar, learned Standing Counsel for Telangana Public Service Commission appears for respondent No.3 in W.A.Nos.1248, 1273 and 1332 of 2025 and respondent No.4 in W.A.No.1270 of 2025. Ms. Uma Devi Nama, learned counsel appears for respondent No.1 in W.A.No.1273 of 2025. Heard learned counsel for the parties. The applicants who were not parties to the writ petition seek to prefer these appeals as against the common impugned order dated 14.10.2025 passed in a batch of writ petitions led by W.P.No.34446 of 2024. The challenge in the writ petition related to recruitment to 563 Group-I posts under Notification No.2 of 2024 dated 19.02.2024. Petitioners approached the writ Court on	
--	--	--	--

		account of their exclusion from 2% sports quota where four vacancies were notified out of 563 posts. Petitioners contended that their exclusion was on account of misconception with reference to application of Form-1 in Annexure-III of G.O.Ms.No.74 dated 09.08.2012, which was referred to in G.O.Ms.No.107 dated 27.07.2018. G.O.Ms.No.5 dated 14.05.2018 provided that in case meritorious sportspersons are not available, the points reserved for them should be deemed to be ceased and allotted to open competition in the same recruitment. The learned writ Court proceeded to hold <i>inter alia</i> as under: “81. In view of the aforesaid discussion, based on the Rules and the said G.O.Ms.No.74, dated 09.08.2012, G.O.Ms.No.5, dated 14.05.2018 and G.O.Ms.No.107, dated 27.07.2018, these Writ Petitions are disposed of with the following directions: a. The respondent authorities are hereby directed to declare the results of the petitioners whose results were withheld pursuant to the Interim Order of this Court and fill up the vacancies if they are found eligible in accordance with Annexure-I and II.	
--	--	---	--

		b. The respondent authorities are further directed to fill up the vacancies which were directed to be kept vacant pursuant to the Interim order of this Court, if they are found eligible strictly in accordance with Annexure-I and II. c. If all the posts have already been filled up as on the date of this order, the appointments so made, shall not be disturbed. However, in all future Notifications, the respondent authorities shall adhere to Annexures I and II respectively while filling up the 2% sports quota. The authorities shall also ask the candidates to produce Forms (I to IV) in relation to their respective sports certificates to verify their genuineness and grading so as to ensure a fair and transparent selection process under the sports quota.” The leave applicants who were in the merit list were excluded on the select merit list being worked out on the basis of the directions passed by the learned writ Court. The appellants except one belong to the General Category. The other one belongs to the Sports Category and had submitted Form-1 of Annexure-III. Since the names of the leave applicants were excluded from the merit list on account of the impugned order, they have sought permission of this Court to	
--	--	--	--

		assail the common impugned order passed by the learned writ Court. Upon hearing learned counsel for the parties, leave applications are allowed. _____ HCJ (AKrS,J) _____ GMM,J <u>I.A.No.2 of 2025 in W.A.No.1248 of 2025;</u> <u>I.A.No.2 of 2025 in W.A.No.1270 of 2025;</u> <u>I.A.No.2 of 2025 in W.A.No.1273 of 2025;</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2025 in W.A.No.1282 of 2025;</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2025 in W.A.No.1303 of 2025;</u> <u>I.A.No.1 of 2025 in W.A.No.1314 of 2025;</u> <u>and</u> <u>I.A.No.3 of 2025 in W.A.No.1332 of 2025</u> For the reasons stated in the supporting affidavits, these interlocutory applications seeking to dispense with filing of certified copies of impugned orders are allowed. _____ HCJ (AKrS,J) _____ GMM, J	
--	--	--	--

		<u>I.A.No.2 of 2025 in W.A.No.1332 of 2025</u> Mr. Baglekar Akash Kumar, learned counsel appears for the appellant. Mr. Allika Suresh, learned counsel for respondent No.1. Mr. S.Rahul Reddy, learned Special Government Pleader attached to the office of learned Additional Advocate General, appears for respondent No.2. Mr. P.S.Rajasekhar, learned Standing Counsel for Telangana Public Service Commission appears for respondent No.3. Mr. B.Chandra Shekhar, learned Standing Counsel for Sports Authority of Telangana State appears for respondent No.4. On hearing learned counsel for the parties and on being satisfied to the explanation urged, the delay of 11 days in filing the instant writ appeal is condoned and I.A.No.2 of 2025 is allowed. HCJ (AKrS,J) GMM, J	
--	--	--	--

		<u>W.A.Nos.1303, 1248, 1270, 1273, 1282, 1314 and 1332 of 2025</u> Mr. G.Vidya Sagar, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Sai Prasen Gundavaram, learned counsel appears for the appellants in W.A.Nos.1248 of 2025 and Ms. K.Udaya Sri, learned counsel appears the appellant in W.A.No.1314 of 2025. Mr. S.Rahul Reddy, learned Special Government Pleader attached to the office of learned Additional Advocate General, appears for the appellants in W.A.No.1303 of 2025, respondent Nos.1 and 2 in W.A.No.1248 of 2025, respondent No.2 in W.A.Nos.1273 and 1332 of 2025, respondent Nos.2 and 3 in W.A.No.1270 of 2025, respondent No.4 in W.A.No.1282 of 2025 and respondent Nos.1 and 4 in W.A.No.1314 of 2025. Mr. Baglekar Akash Kumar, learned counsel appears for the appellants in W.A.Nos.1270, 1273, 1282 and 1332 of 2025. Mr. E.Madan Mohan Rao, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Kongara Raj Kumar, learned counsel for respondent Nos.5 to 11/writ petitioners in W.A.No.1248 of 2025. Mr. B.Chandra Shekhar, learned	
--	--	---	--

		Standing Counsel for Sports Authority of Telangana State appears for respondent No.3 in W.A.Nos.1303 and 1314 of 2025, respondent No.4 in W.A.Nos.1248 and 1332 of 2025, respondent No.5 in W.A.No.1270 of 2025 and respondent No.6 in W.A.No.1282 of 2025. Mr. Allika Suresh, learned counsel for respondent No.1 in W.A.No.1332 of 2025. Mr. P.S.Rajasekhar, learned Standing Counsel for Telangana Public Service Commission appears for respondent No.2 in W.A.Nos.1303 and 1314 of 2025 and respondent No.3 in W.A.Nos.1248, 1273, 1282 and 1332 of 2025 and respondent No.4 in W.A.No.1270 of 2025. Mr. Ramesh Chilla, learned counsel appears for respondent No.1 in W.A.No.1303 of 2025. Ms. Uma Devi Nama, learned counsel appears for respondent No.1 in W.A.No.1273 of 2025 and respondent Nos.1 and 2 in 1282 of 2025. Heard learned counsel for the parties. The issue involved in the present appeals is application of G.O.Ms.No.74 dated 09.08.2012 specifically Clause (xii) thereof extracted hereunder read along with G.O.Ms.No.107 dated 27.07.2018 Sub-	
--	--	--	--

		Clause (iii) thereof in the matter of selection of meritorious sports person under the recruitment Notification No.28 of 2022 dated 29.12.2022. “(xii) The appointing authorities shall call for applications by publishing in leading news papers in English/Telugu/Urdu languages from meritorious sportspersons along with the certificates in Form-I, Form-II, Form-III and Form-IV as the case may be, vide Annexure-III enclosed to this notification and shall submit the same to the Sports Authority of Andhra Pradesh. After scrutiny by the Sports Authority of Andhra Pradesh, like genuineness of the certificates, verifying medals/ranks etc., the applications will be forwarded to a Committee at Government level in the Youth Advancement, Tourism and Culture (Sports) Department and the said Committee shall finalise the proposals. The said Committee shall issue eligibility certificate for appointment under Sports quota.” Clause (vi) under the heading “Reservation” of the Notification No.28 of 2022 quoted hereunder prescribes reservation to meritorious sportsperson as per amendments made to State and Sporting Service Rules as per G.O.Ms.No.107 dated	
--	--	---	--

		27.07.2018 i.e., in Rule 2 for Sub-Rule 20 and Rule 22(i) for Sub-Rule 2 Clause-D. “vi) The reservation to Meritorious Sports Person is applicable as per the amendments made to State and Subordinate Service Rules as per G.O.Ms.No.107, General Administration (Ser.D) Dept., Dt. 27-07-2018 that is in Rule-2, for sub-Rule (20) and in Rule-22 (i) in sub-Rule (2), for Class-D. In implementing the reservation to Meritorious Sports Person as per G.O.Ms.No.05 YAT&C (Sports) Department, Dt. 14/05/2018, or as may be revised by the Government from time to time shall be followed.” It further provided that in implementing the reservation to meritorious sports person as per G.O.Ms.No.5 dated 14.05.2018, or as may be revised by the Government from time to time shall be followed. Petitioners were excluded in the merit list as they did not provide the relevant Form-1 under Annexure-III of G.O.Ms.No.74 dated 09.08.2012. On the part of the appellants, it has been contended that G.O.Ms.No.107 dated 27.07.2018 Sub-Clause (iii) specifically provides for implementation of guidelines issued in G.O.Ms.No.74 dated 09.08.2012	
--	--	---	--

	for reservation to meritorious sportspersons and as per G.O.Ms.No.74 dated 09.08.2012 Clause (xii), applicants seeking recruitment in the category of meritorious sports person have to submit certificates in Form-1, Form-2, Form-3 and Form-4 as the case may be <i>vide</i> Annexure-III enclosed to the Notification in G.O.Ms.No.74 dated 09.08.2012. Annexure-I provides list of recognized sports disciplines for 2% reservation in direct recruitment in Government Departments and institutions. Annexure-II provides for priorities of sports and games for recruitment of 2% reservation under sports quota. Annexure-III contains the four Forms. Form-1 prescribes the certificate issued to a meritorious sports person for employment in Group-I and Group-II posts and services under the State Government. Form-2 relates to Group-III posts and services. Form-3 relates to Group-IV posts and services and Form-4 relates to Last Grade Service for appointment as a meritorious sports person. While the appellants contend that due to non-filing of applicable Form-1 relevant to recruitment to Group-I and II services under the recruitment Notification No.28 of 2022 dated 29.12.2022, the writ petitioners were	
--	--	--

	excluded from the merit list and as per G.O.Ms.No.5 dated 14.05.2018, the appellants excluding one of them who filled Form-1 of Annexure-III were included since the vacancies had to be reverted to the open category. According to them, for filling up of the relevant Forms as per G.O.Ms.No.107 dated 27.07.2018, Rules are to be read with the guidelines prescribed under G.O.Ms.No.74 dated 09.08.2012. The learned writ Court committed an error in directing consideration of only Annexures I and II for preparation of the merit list and asking the Recruiting Agency to refer to the relevant Forms in Annexure-III only at the time of certificate verification. Reliance on the judgment rendered by the learned Single Bench of Andhra Pradesh High Court [W.P.No.11057 of 2021, dated 29.07.2021; W.P.No.16062 of 2020, dated 09.08.2024 and W.P.No.13979 of 2020, dated 24.01.2022] on this issue is misplaced as the relevant G.O.Ms.No.13 dated 23.01.2018 did not refer to implementation of the relevant clause under G.O.Ms.No.74 dated 09.08.2012. On the part of the writ petitioners, the findings of the learned writ Court have been supported. It is their contention that for	
--	--	--

	purposes of selecting meritorious sportspersons, Annexures-I and II are only relevant. The learned writ Court rightly directed the Recruiting Agency to prepare the merit list on that basis. Production of relevant Form under Annexure-III should be done at the time of certificate verification. The intent of applicable Rule read with the recruitment notification is to provide employment to meritorious sportspersons depending upon the discipline and the priority of the sports indicated in Annexures I and II of G.O.Ms.No.74 dated 09.08.2012. Annexure-III becomes relevant only for verifying the credentials of the candidate after the merit list is prepared. On the part of the Public Service Commission and the State, it is contended that the claim for appointment in Group-I or Group-II service by a meritorious sports person can only be evaluated on submission of the relevant Form-1 as per Annexure-III. Annexures I and II only prescribe the concerned sports discipline and the priority amongst the sports discipline. Writ petitioners, if they do not fulfil the requirement of having participated in the international sports as required under Form-1 of Annexure-III, could not have a	
--	---	--

		valid claim for being included in the merit list for recruitment to Group-II services. It is also submitted that the corrigendum issued by the Public Service Commission did not amount to change in the Rules of the game as the Rules were already determined in terms of G.O.Ms.No.107 dated 27.07.2018 read with G.O.Ms.No.74 dated 09.08.2012, which insisted on implementing the guidelines as prescribed therein and submission of the relevant Forms. It is submitted that other appeals may also be filed by the aggrieved persons against the common impugned order. Upon consideration of the rival submissions of the parties, we are of the view that the issue requires detailed consideration on merits. Therefore, let all these appeals be listed under admission on 12.01.2026. In the meantime, there shall be interim suspension of the impugned order. HCJ (AKrS,J) GMM, J KL	
--	--	--	--