Date of reserved for orders : 21.09.2026
Date of pronouncement : 16.10.2026
Date of uploading : 16.10.2026

APHC010142892026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

FRIDAY, THE 16th DAY OF OCTOBER 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE A. HARI HARANADHA SARMA

WRIT APPEAL NO: 658 OF 2026

Between:

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

...Petitioners

AND

1. G FOUZIA BANU, C/o G Saluddin Aged about 30 years R/o H NO 49/50A87C8 Lakshmi Nagar Kallur Mandal Kurnool District Andhra Pradesh 518002

2. Chakka Swathi, C/o Batha dharma Rao Aged 29 Years R/o 151 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 11 Gudalavari Palem Varadaiahpalem kalathuru Talarivettu Chittoor District517541

6. Gugulothu Sankar Naik, C/o Gagulothu Srinu Aged about 35 years R/o 279 Machinenipalem Vatsavai Mandal Krishna District521402

7. Duggirala Krishna, S/o Nageswara Rao Aged about 33 years R/o 1127/1 S T Colony Vavilala Tiruvuru Mandalam Krishna District521325

8. Pavan Kumar Kothala, S/o Late Tata Aged about 39 Years R/o 329 Pathavalsa Post Kotapadu Visakhapatnam AP 531034

9. Alamanda Sowjanya, D/o alamanda Venkata Ramana Aged about 36 years R/o R/o 11 Kothamallampeta Visakhapatnam AP 531084

10. Kanchimireddy Aruna Kumari, D/o Ankireddy Aged about 29 years R/o 133 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 353 B C Colony Pedda Harivanam Kurnool518308

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondents: G V S KISHORE KUMAR

WRIT APPEAL NO: 362 OF 2026

Between:

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, Rep by its Principal Secretary School Education Department A P Secretariat Velagapudi Amaravati Guntur District

2. The Director of School Education, Andhra Pradesh D No 398/3 Vidya Bhavan Venkatadri Towers Atmakur Village Mangalagiri Guntur District

3. The Convenor, Mega DSC2025 The Andhra Pradesh Teachers Recruitment Test TRT Vidya Bhavan Venkatadri Towers Atmakur Village Mangalagiri Guntur District

...Petitioners

AND

1. KAMIREDDY BHAVANI, D/o K Venkata Ramana Aged about 28 years Occ Unemployee R/o D No 421 Regulapalem Village Yelamanchili Mandal Visakhapatnam District Andhra Pradesh

...Respondent

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondent KAVITHA GOTTIPATI

WRIT APPEAL NO: 404 OF 2026

Between:

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

...Petitioners

AND

1. BANDEGIRI BASHIRUN, D/o Pedda Murthuja Aged about 25 years R/o H No 8 Kurukunda Kurnool District Andhra Pradesh 518422

2. Chowdavaram Siva Kumar, S/o Chowdavaram Yanadaiah Aged 34 Years R/o 2/7 A Korlakunta Obulavaripalli Mandal Korlakunta Cuddapah Andhra Pradesh 516108

3. U Anil Kumar, S/o Uppari Sunkanna Aged about 28 years R/o H No 249 Penchikalapadu VTC Gudur Mandal Kurnool District Andhra Pradesh 518467

4. S Maruthi Prasad, S/o S Kullayappa Aged about 30 years R/o H No 1134 B P Siddarampuram Anantapur District Andhra Pradesh 515751

5. Kolimi Ghouse, s/o Kolimi Bashulla Aged about 31 years R/o 5/67 Muslim Street Pattikonda Kurnool District AP 518380

6. Nekkala Sivaranjani, D/o Nekkala Veera Koti Bhimeswararao Aged about 29 years R/o H No 232 Syamalambha Street East Godavari District Andhra Pradesh 533343

7. Muddam Naga Jyothi, C/o Yalla Raghavendra Rao Aged about 38 years R/o H No 25/4191B827 Nandamuri Nagar Nandyal Nandyal District Andhra Pradesh 518501

8. Kuruva Nataraju, S/o Kumva Giddanna Aged about 27 years R/o H No 2/82 Kothapalli Kurnool District Andhra Pradesh 518380

9. Sugali Devibai, W/o Paluthya Laxman Naik Aged about 28 years R/o H No 131 LThanda Kurnool District Andhra Pradesh 518216

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondents: G V S KISHORE KUMAR

WRIT APPEAL NO: 580 OF 2026

Between:

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 Convener/Chairman O/o Commissioner of School Education, Amaravati.

...Petitioners

AND

1. K B RAVEENDRA KUMAR, S/o K Chinna Naga Lingamaiah, 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.

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondents: G V S KISHORE KUMAR

WRIT APPEAL NO: 582 OF 2026

Between:

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 Andhrdi 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 Amaravat

...Petitioners

AND

1. VARRI SAI SRAVANTHI, D/o Varri Venkata Satya Sanyasi Naidu Aged about 28 years R/o 5208 Anjaneyaswami Temple Street Tuni Mandal East Godavari District Andhra Pradesh 533401

2. Viswanadhapalli Suresh, S/o Narayana Rao Aged about 41 years R/o 2610 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 291 Gajapathinagaram Chodavaram Visakhapatnam District Andhra Pradesh 531023

5. Amaresu Srinivasa Rao, S/o A Mutyalu Aged about 43 years R/o 247A Martur Kolapudi Prakasam District Andhra Pradesh 523261

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondents: G V S KISHORE KUMAR

WRIT APPEAL NO: 583 OF 2026

Between:

1. THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, Rep by its Principal Secretary, school Education Department, Secretariat, Valagapudi, 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 Convener/Chairman O/o Commissioner of School Education, Amaravati.

...Petitioners

AND

1. M MOHAN, S/o.M. Gajendran, aged about 29 years, R/o D.No.6119, Nagari, Chitoor 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's Andhra Pradesh-518222.

3. SMS Niranjani, ID/o Mekala Subramanyam, Aged 43 Years,' R/o. 1499, Shop Street, Puttur, Chitoor District, Andhra Pradesh-517583.

4. G R Sailaja, , D/o G Rama Moorthy, Aged about 37 Years, R/o D.No.570/1, Y Sreepathi Rao Street, Oldpet, Palamaner, Chitoor District, Andhra Pradesh - 517408.

5. Khandavalli Vamsi Krishna, S/o.Satya Prasad, Aged 40 years, R/o. Door No.233, Ravi Chettu Veedhi, Maredubaka, Mandapeta, East Godavari District,533308.

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondents:

WRIT APPEAL NO: 585 OF 2026

Between:

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.

...Petitioners

AND

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 Sanni Babu, Aged about 34 Years, R/o. 1-161, Indiramma Colony, Munagapaka, Visakhapatnam District, Andhra Pradesh- 531033.

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondents: G V S KISHORE KUMAR

WRIT APPEAL NO: 606 OF 2026

Between:

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/0 Commissioner of School Education Amaravati

...Petitioners

AND

1. VENKATA SIVA REDDY Y, S/o Venkata Linga Reddy Y Aged about 40 years R/o D No 2106A Seetharamapuran Nandipalle Mahanadi Kurnool District Andhra Pradesh 518502

2. Shaik Sameer Basha, S/o Shaik Shajahan Aged about 33 years R/o D No v3/7563 Opposite Gautam Water Aravinda Ashramam ProddaturUrban 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 261 Kovila MPADU Chandrasekarapuram Prakasam District Andhra Pradesh 523112

5. Pabbuleti Prasad, S/o Pabbuleti Venkateswarlu Aged about 43 years Rio D No 1473 Near Mosque Ponnekallu Tadikonda Guntur District Andhra Pradesh 522018

6. Janavath Kalavathi Bai, D/o J Akash Naik Aged about 32 years Rio D No1179 G Thanda Gorukallu Panyam Kurnool District Andhra Pradesh 5185

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondents: G V S KISHORE KUMAR

WRIT APPEAL NO: 613 OF 2026

Between:

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

...Petitioners

AND

1. PAPPALA BHAVANI, D/o SuriNaidu Aged about 29 years R/o Cl Malyada Nelimarla Vizianagaram Andhra Pradesh 535218

2. Allu Gumpaswamy, S/o Late Allu Sunkuru Aged about 33 years R/o Parvathipuram Chappavanivalsa Thailaburidi VizianagaramAP 535527

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondents: G V S KISHORE KUMAR

WRIT APPEAL NO: 613 OF 2026

Between:

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

...Petitioners

AND

1. PAPPALA BHAVANI, D/o SuriNaidu Aged about 29 years R/o Cl Malyada Nelimarla Vizianagaram Andhra Pradesh 535218

2. Allu Gumpaswamy, S/o Late Allu Sunkuru Aged about 33 years R/o Parvathipuram Chappavanivalsa Thailaburidi VizianagaramAP 535527

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondents: G V S KISHORE KUMAR

WRIT APPEAL NO: 615 OF 2026

Between:

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

...Petitioners

AND

1. Sivarathri Triveni, D/o SivarathriSrinivasarao Aged about 26 years R/o D No 14146 Ranga Colony 2nd ward Sattenapalle Mandal Sattenapalle Guntur Andhra Pradesh522403

...Respondent

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondent GVS KISHORE KUMAR

WRIT APPEAL NO: 652 OF 2026

Between:

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

...Petitioners

AND

1. PUNDUKURA SHIVA REDDY, S/o Pundukura Narahari Reddy Aged38 Years R/o Door No 2/149 Bangaramavva Street Rachumaari Mantralayam Kurnool District518319

2. Sreenivasulu Derangi, S/o Derangi Venkata Ramana R/o D No 5119 Near Venkateswara Temple Kadapa District 516349

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioners: GP FOR SCHOOL EDUCATION

Counsel for the Respondents: G V S KISHORE KUMAR

WRIT PETITION NO: 1908 OF 2026

Between:

1. SHAIK MOULALI, S/o Abdul Salam, Aged about 44 years, R/o.D.No.23-3-9/1, Chirala Urban, Prakasam District-523155.

...Petitioner

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravati Guntur District-522238.

2. The Commissioner of School Education, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Amaravati, Guntur District-522503

3. The Director of School Education, Andhra Pradesh D.No.398/3,Vidya Bhavan Venkatadri Towers, Atmakur Village, Mangalagiri Guntur District-522302

4. The Andhra Pradesh District Selection Committee, (AP DSC) - 2025, Rep. by its Convenor/Chairman, Mega DSC2025, The A.P Teachers Recruitment Test (TRT) Vidya Bhavan, Venkatadri Towers, Atmakur Village, Mangalagiri Guntur District-522503

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner: THOKA DEVA DEEPAK ANIRUDH YADAV

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR SERVICES III

WRIT PETITION NO: 1912 OF 2026

Between:

1. MALLEPOGU BHRATHI, D/o. M.Batukanna, Aged about 33 years, R/o.D.No.6-259, Dwaraka Nagar, Opp Sachivalayam office, Perur, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

2. Salapu Anand, S/o.Salapu Bommu Naidu, Aged about 30 years, R/o.D.No.1-167, Raja Street, Gumadam Bondapalle Vizianagaram District- 535221.

3. .Bhargava Nagendra Prasad Penke, , S/o.Appa Rao aged about 26 years, R/o.D.No.2-43, Kothuru Village, Tuni Mandal, East Godavari District.

...Petitioners

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, School Education Department, Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravati, Guntur District-522238.

2. The Commissioner of School Education, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Amaravati, Guntur District-522503

3. The Director of School Education, , Andhra Pradesh D.No.398/3,Vidya Bhavan Venkatadri Towers, Atmakur Village, Mangalagiri Guntur District-522302

4. The Andhra Pradesh District Selection Committee, (AP DSC) - 2025, Rep. by its Convenor/Chairman, Mega DSC2025, The A.P Teachers Recruitment Test (TRT) Vidya Bhavan, Venkatadri Towers, Atmakur Village, Mangalagiri Guntur District-522503

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioners: THOKA DEVA DEEPAK
ANIRUDH YADAV

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR SERVICES III

WRIT PETITION NO: 9778 OF 2026

Between:

1. Shaik Jawahar Sulthana, W/o. Mazharuddin, aged about 44 years, Occ Teacher, R/o. East Street, H.No.7-240, Atmakur, Nellore District-524322

...Petitioner

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, Rep. by its Principal Secretary School Education Department, A.P.Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravati Guntur District-522238.

2. The Director of School Education, Andhra Pradesh, D.No. 398/3 Vidhya Bhavan, Venkatadri Towers Atmakur Village, Mangalagiri Guntur District-522503

3. The Conveyor, Mega DSC-2025 - - The Andhra Pradesh Teachers Recruitment Test(TRT), Vidya Bhavan, Venkatadri Tovyers Atmakur Village, Mangalagiri Guntur District-522503

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner: KOMARA PRUDHVI RAJ

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR SERVICES III

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE A.HARI HARANADHA SARMA

WRIT APPEAL Nos.658, 362, 404, 580, 582, 583, 585, 606, 613, 615 & 652 of 2026

and

WRIT PETITION Nos.1908, 1912 and 9778 of 2026

COMMON JUDGMENT: (*Per* Hon'ble Sri Justice D.Ramesh*)*

Writ Appeal No.658 of 2026 is filed by the State aggrieved by the order dated 07.01.2026 in W.P.No.25763 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.

2. Writ Appeal No.362 of 2026 is filed by the State aggrieved by the order dated 29.12.2025 in W.P.No.23243 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.

3. Writ Appeal No.404 of 2026 is filed by the State aggrieved by the order dated 29.12.2025 in W.P.No.23487 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.

4. Writ Appeal No.580 of 2026 is filed by the State aggrieved by the order dated 07.01.2026 in W.P.No.25744 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.

5. Writ Appeal No.582 of 2026 is filed by the State aggrieved by the order dated 07.01.2026 in W.P.No.26312 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.

6. Writ Appeal No.583 of 2026 is filed by the State aggrieved by the order dated 07.01.2026 in W.P.No.27843 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.

7. Writ Appeal No.585 of 2026 is filed by the State aggrieved by the order dated 07.01.2026 in W.P.No.26323 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.

8. Writ Appeal No.606 of 2026 is filed by the State aggrieved by the order dated 07.01.2026 in W.P.No.28655 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.

9. Writ Appeal No.613 of 2026 is filed by the State aggrieved by the order dated 07.01.2026 in W.P.No.24771 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.

10. Writ Appeal No.615 of 2026 is filed by the State aggrieved by the order dated 07.01.2026 in W.P.No.25501 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.

11. Writ Appeal No.652 of 2026 is filed by the State aggrieved by the order dated 07.01.2026 in W.P.No.26700 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge.

12. Writ Petition No.1908 of 2026 is filed seeking the following relief:

> *"….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 petitioner selection to the post of School Assistant (SA) Urdu Medium in the AP MEGA DSC-2025 on the basis of merit-cum-roster, and instead giving precedence to the preferences exercised by the Petitioner 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 Petitioner 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 petitioner for School Assistant post based on the 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) dehors the options preferred by the petitioner in the notification dt.20.04.2025 in the interests of justice…."

13. Writ Petition No.1912 of 2026 is filed seeking the following relief:

"….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 Assistant (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…."

14. Writ Petition No.9778 of 2026 is filed seeking the following relief:

"….to issue a writ or order or direction more particularly one the nature of a writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in not considering case of petitioner for selection and appointment as Post Graduate Teacher (L)-Hindi despite she got qualified to the said post in pursuant to Notification No.01/Mega- DSC-TRC- 1/2025 dated 20-04-2025 of the 2nd respondent is illegal, arbitrary, unjust and violative of Article 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to consider case of petitioner for change of her post for selection and appointment to the Post Graduate Teacher (L)-Hindi as per her merit in Mega DSC- 2025 without reference to the order of preferences chosen in the application ID No. MDSC0092629 in pursuant to the Notification No.OI/Mega-DSC TRC- 2025 dated 20-04-2025 of the 2nd respondent…."

15. Heard the learned Advocate General appearing for the appellants and Smt. Kavitha Gottipati and Sri G.V.S.Kishore Kumar learned counsels appearing for the respondents.

16. As the issue involved in all the cases is one and the same, this Court heard them jointly, and they are being disposed of by this common judgment, taking W.A.No.404 of 2026 as a leading case.

17. The appellants and respondents are hereinafter referred to as respondents and petitioners as they were referred in the writ petitions.

18. The petitioners have filed the writ petitions declaring the action of the respondents in not considering their selection to the posts of School Assistants (SA) in AP Mega DSC-2025 on the basis of merit-cum-roster and instead of giving precedence to the preferences exercised by them 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 examination was conducted for each post and separate merit list was prepared for each post and

the same is contrary to guide line No.24 clause (d) of the notification dated 20.04.2025, as illegal and arbitrary.

19. A notification was issued by the 1st respondent on 20.04.2025 inviting applications for recruitment to 16,347 teaching posts under various cadres such as SGT, SA, PET, TGT and PGT including special education. Pursuant to the said notification, all the petitioners have made applications for multiple posts, including School Assistants (SA) and Secondary Grade Teachers (SGT), Physical Education Teachers (PET), Trained Graduate Teachers (TGT) and Post Graduate Teachers (PGT) and they were all selected and appointed for different posts based on their options/preferences exercised in the application forms. They were all eligible for consideration of School Assistant Post based on their merit but, the same was denied only on the ground of options exercised by the petitioners in their application forms.

20. Guideline No.24 clause-(d) of the notification expressly states that the allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit-cum-roster and vacancy position. This clause firmly says that merit, subject to the applicable reservation

roster and availability of vacancies is the sole and primary basis for allotment of posts. The petitioners have secured the merit ranking and besides they all fit into the roster as the vacancies are very much available. However, the respondents in flagrant violation of merit-cum-roster have issued a press note on 29.08.2025 stating that the options chosen by the candidates are final irrespective of merit. The preference of post is only a procedural mechanism to facilitate administrative convenience but the said aspect cannot override the substantial right to the selection based on superior merit and eligibility under reservation roster. Based on the notification and press release dated 29.08.2025, the selection process was completed on 28.08.2025 and the petitioners received call letters directing them to appear before the respective verification committees and accordingly, they all have attended before the verification committees in the presence of the Gazetted Officers. However, in the press release dated 29.08.2025, the respondents have emphasized only the preference exercised by the candidates, while failing to give effect to the merit-cum-roster principle mandated under Clause 24(d) of the Notification dated 20.04.2025.

21. The petitioners have applied for multiple posts under the AP Mega DSC Notification dated 20.04.2025 by paying prescribed fees separately and conducted separate examinations for all the posts and accordingly, they have all successfully qualified in the examinations and have secured ranks placing all of them well within the zone of selection under the School Assistant category. However, the unmindful and arbitrary action of the respondents in ignoring the merit of the petitioners in the School Assistant post and instead of confining their selection to other cadres only on the basis of the order of preference is irrational, discriminatory and contrary to the notification issued.

22. For the above said contentions, the respondents have filed their counter narrating the petitioners' marks, preferences and how they were selected based on their merit. According to the counter, all the writ petitioners have chosen preferences with SGT - Government/Local Bodies as their first choice, School Assistant (non-local) - Social Studies Government/Local Bodies as their second choice and School Assistant - Social Studies Municipal Corporation at Visakhapatnam as their third choice. The respondents have also provided editing window from the date of application to that of the last date of submission of the

application i.e., from 20.04.2025 to 15.05.2025 enabling the petitioners/applicants to edit their options in the applications. Despite such facility, all the petitioners have selected the order of preference first as Secondary Grade Teacher. In fact, School Education - Mega DSC-2025 - The Andhra Pradesh Teacher Recruitment Test (AP TRT) for the posts of School Assistants (SA), Secondary Grade Teachers (SGT) in Government, Zilla Parishad, Mandal Parishad, Municipality Schools, Municipal Corporation Schools, Tribal Welfare Ashram Schools, and for the posts Secondary Grade Teachers (SGT) and Physical Education Teachers (PET) in the Juvenile Welfare Department schools and for the posts of Trained Graduate Teachers (TGT-Special Education), Secondary Grade Teachers (SGT-Special Education) and Physical Education Teachers (PET) in the Department for the Welfare of Differently Abled Schools in the State – Scheme of Selection Rules, 2025 (for short, 'the Rules, 2025') issued G.O.Ms.No.15, dated 19.04.2025. Rule 10(iii) and (f) of the Rules, 2025 clearly specified that once a candidate is selected for a post based on the given order of preference, he/she will forfeit the opportunity to be considered for the remaining posts or managements. Accordingly, the candidate's name will be

automatically removed from all other selection list for which he/she had applied. This ensures that each selected candidate is allotted only one post as per the declared preference. It is pertinent to submit that the scheme of selection and rules framed under statute are binding on all the applicants.

23. It is further averred that awareness campaigns through print media repeatedly cautioning candidates to exercise utmost care while selecting the post preferences and emphasizing in official communications that such preferences would be treated as final. Even during application submission, all candidates were required to confirm an undertaking that they had read and understood the rules and notification. As the petitioners have voluntarily agreed to the terms and conditions, now they are estopped from seeking modifications. In fact, the respondents have inserted Rule 10(iii)(d) to (f) of the Rules, 2025 following the Central Civil Services Examination Rules wherein also multiple posts including Group-A and Group-B posts. Rule 14 of the Civil Services Examination Rules, 2025 states that at the time of initial applications only post preferences are to be given and such a preference once given cannot be changed. Even in that the candidates are eligible for more than one category of service and

wishes to complete for both has to give their order of preference at the time of completing the application and any alteration will not be entertained. They have also stated that to ensure the transparency in the recruitment process, the choice of option was given at the time of submission of the application itself to the candidates and the petitioners were aware of this process and accordingly, they have exercised their preferences for the posts of Secondary Grande Teacher and then School Assistant. After calling for the certificate verification, then only they have raised an objection and requested for consideration of the School Assistant Post, which is contrary to the notification as well as the Rules issued in G.O.Ms.No.15.

24. Considering the rival contentions, the learned Single Judge has allowed the writ petitions with a direction to the respondents to consider the petitioners as per their merit rank for appointment in respective subjects to the post of School Assistant (SA) within a period of two (2) months from the date of receipt of the copy of the order. Aggrieved by the same, the present intra-court appeals are filed.

25. The learned Advocate General appearing on behalf of the appellants - State has mainly contended that the orders of the learned Single Jude are contrary to the Rules issued in G.O.Ms.No.15 and also the Notification dated 20.04.2025. Primarily the contention of the appellants/respondents is that the petitioners have not challenged the said rules and without there being a challenge, the learned Single Judge ought not to have allowed the writ petitions contrary to the statutory rules. In support of his contentions, he mainly placed reliance on the following:

26. The learned Single Judge has allowed the writ petitions only placing reliance on the guidelines issued in the notification dated 20.04.2025 more specifically guideline No.24 clause (d) which stipulates that the allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit-cum-roster and vacancy position. But, surprisingly, the learned Single Judge has not taken into consideration guideline No.24 clause (c), which clearly demonstrates that the options exercised in the online application shall be final. The learned Advocate General has further submitted that the said guidelines issued in the notification are in terms of the Rules issued in G.O.Ms.No.15, dated

19.04.2025. The Government has formulated the Rules, 2025. The said Rules were issued under Article 309 of the Constitution of India read with sub-section (3) and (4) of Section 169, sub-sections (3) and (4) of Section 195 and Section 243 of the Andhra Pradesh Panchayat Raj Act, (Andhra Pradesh Act 13 of 1994) and Section 74 of the Andhra Pradesh Municipalities Act, 1965 and Sections 78 and 99 of the Andhra Pradesh Education Act, 1982 read with sub-section (1) of Section 23 of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009. Rule (3) of the Rules, 2025 deals with method of recruitment, which reads as follows:

> "***3. METHOD OF RECRUITMENT:***
>
> *The Recruitment shall be through a selection process consisting of Computer Based Test (CBT) and other criteria stipulated by the Government from time to time.*
>
> *(i) For School Assistant (SA), Secondary Grade Teacher (SGT), Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT- Special Education in Special Schools), Secondary Grade Teacher (SGT- Special Education in Special Schools), the total marks shall be 100, out of which 80 marks (TRT-80%) for the written test (Computer Based Test) and remaining 20 marks (20%) for APTET/CTET Weightage.*

(ii) For School Assistants (Physical Education) (SA-P.E.) and Physical Education Teacher (PET), the total marks shall be 100 for written test (Computer Based Test) only. No TET for PET and School Assistant (Physical Education).

(iii) Recruitment shall be purely based on merit-cum-roster system as per the existing provisions being adopted by the Government of Andhra Pradesh vide G.O.Ms.No.77, G.A. (Ser-D) Dept., Dt: 02.08.2023 and subsequent G.O.Ms.No:12, S.E (Services-I) Dept., Dt: 15.04.2025, G.O.Ms.No.46, G.A. (Ser-D) Dept., Dt: 19.04.2025, and G.O.Ms.No.47, G.A (Ser-D) Dept., Dt: 19.04.2025."

27. Rule 10 of the Rules, 2025 speaks about submission of application forms which is most relevant for the applicants/petitioners while making applications. It reads as follows:

"10. SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION FORMS:

(i) Candidates who are qualified and intending to apply for posts notified in respect of any district shall submit online application as per prescribed procedure.

(ii) Candidates who submit false/fake information in online application form shall be liable for criminal prosecution besides rejection of the application or cancellation of selection, as the case may be.

(iii) Management wise and Post wise Option*: Since, the notification is issued including the vacant teacher posts under different managements run by the government, the candidates applying for the posts should mandatorily follow the below procedure:-*

a) *The candidates can apply for more than one post under different managements as per his eligibility.*

b) *If a candidate intends to apply for more than one post, he/she must indicate the order of preference for the posts at the time of submitting the application.*

For example*: If a candidate is applying for multiple positions such as School Assistant (Physics), Trained Graduate Teacher (TGT), and School Assistant (Mathematics), they should clearly specify their preferences in a sequential order - e.g., 1st preference: School Assistant (Physics), 2nd preference: TGT, 3rd preference: School Assistant (Mathematics). This order of preference will be considered during the selection and allotment process, and once submitted, it cannot be changed*

c) The Options exercised in the online application, shall be final.

d) *The allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit cum roster, and vacancy position.*

e) *If a candidate applied for more than one post and comes under zone of selection of different posts / managements, he/she will be selected as per the priority option exercised by the candidate at the time of application submission. And his/her name will not be considered for remaining posts selection.*

f) *Once a candidate is selected for a post based on the given order of preference, he/she will forfeit the opportunity to be considered for the remaining posts or managements. Accordingly, the candidate's name will be automatically removed from all other selection lists for which he/she had applied. This ensures that each selected candidate is allotted only one post, as per the declared preference.*

g) *Candidates are advised to exercise their option with extreme caution while selecting their order of preferences for posts /managements.*

h) *The candidate must personally complete all sections of the application form and thoroughly review the information before submission.*

i) *Once application is submitted, the same shall be final and no option for editing the application.*

j) *The candidate will be solely responsible for the accuracy of the information provided."*

28. This Rule was in fact extracted in the notification issued on 20.04.2025. The above referred Rule 10(a) of the Rules, 2025 enables the candidates to apply for more than one post under different managements. Rule 10(b) of the Rules, 2025 enables the candidates to exercise their preference for the posts. Rule 10(c) of the Rules, 2025 explicitly tells that the said option exercised in terms of Rule 10(b) shall be final. Rule 10(d) of the Rules, 2025 speaks about allotment of posts to the selected candidates in terms of the above options based on merit-cum-roster. Rule 10(e) of the Rules, 2025 clearly stipulates the procedure how to selections should be made. Rule 10(f) of the Rules, 2025 contemplates that once a candidate is selected for a particular post based on the given order of preference, he/she will forfeit the opportunity to be considered for the remaining posts.

29. In fact, in terms of the averments made in the counter, the authorities have also provided an opportunity to the candidates for editing their options and the same was also communicated through the media to all the candidates cautioning with regard to their options. Knowing fully well about the same, the petitioners have opted for the post of Secondary Grade Teacher as their first preference and in terms of the Rules, 2025 and also the

conditions imposed in the notification, they were all selected to their preferred post based on their marks and roster which is in terms of Rule 10(iii) coupled with Rule 3(iii) of the Rules, 2025 and while making selections the recruiting authorities have not deviated any of these Rules. Hence, if the petitioners have any grievance, they should have challenged the Rules, 2025 and also the conditions stipulated in the notification. Without doing so, they are not entitled to seek for Mandamus for appointment to the post of School Assistant contrary to the Rules, 2025 and preference exercised along with their applications. The learned Single Judge failed to consider this aspect though the respondents have specifically raised in their counter. Hence, the impugned orders are contrary to the statutory rules and also the conditions stipulated in the notification.

30. To substantiate the same, the learned Advocate General has mainly placed reliance on the prayer portion of the writ petitions, wherein the prayers are more or less similar. The petitioners have sought a declaration that the action of the respondents in not considering their cases for selection and appointment as School Assistants despite having qualifications to the said posts is illegal and arbitrary.

31. In support of his contentions, the learned Advocate General has placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Dhanraj v. Vikram Singh***[1]**,** wherein it was held at paragraph Nos. 11, 12 and 13 as follows:

> "***11.*** *With greatest respect to the learned counsel for the original writ petitioners, we cannot accept any of these submissions. There is not even a whisper of a challenge incorporated in the writ petition to the 1961 Act and the rules framed thereunder. The State was not called upon to answer the issue of either repugnancy or lack of legislative competence. Moreover, there was no notice issued to the Advocate General of the State.*
>
> ***12.*** *In absence of specific pleadings, a Writ Court ought not to have gone into the issues of repugnancy or lack of legislative competence. Learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioners (6th and 7th respondents) relies upon various decisions of this Court including the landmark decision in the case of* ***S.P.Gupta v. Union of India***[2]***.***
>
> ***13.*** *We are of the view that in absence of any specific challenge to the validity of the statutory provisions, the High Court ought not to have undertaken the exercise of going into the question of repugnancy. We fail to understand the propriety of the observation that the law departments of the State and the Union should have a dialogue to remove the*

[1] 2023 SCC OnLine SC 724
[2] 1981 Supp SCC 87

discrepancy. Moreover, the High Court has not proceeded to strike down the relevant provisions which were held to be repugnant to PESA. It only directs that till the discrepancy is removed by the legislature, certain provisions of the 1961 Act and the rules framed thereunder shall be ignored. Such approach by the writ Court is not at all called for. Without holding that the statutory provisions are not constitutionally valid, the High Court could not have issued a direction not to implement the statutory provisions.

32. The learned Advocate General submitted that in the above referred paragraphs, the Hon'ble Apex Court has categorically held that without challenge to any rule and without having specific pleadings the Court cannot go into the issue of repugnancy or lack of legislative competence and further held that the Court ought not to have undergone the exercise of question of repugnancy. Further, the learned Single Judge has erroneously interpreted the two clauses as being repugnant to each other. In fact, the selections were made purely based on merit-cum-roster and there was no deviation with regard to the merit. When there was no deviation with regard to the merit, the selection was made based on the merit according to their preference of options.

33. Further, he placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Madhya Pradesh Public Service Commission v.***

Manish Bakawale[3]. In this judgment also the facts are identical as the Madhya Pradesh Service Commission has also issued advertisement inviting online applications from eligible candidates for the State Service Examination for various categories of posts in different departments. In that also, the candidates were permitted to exercise their options/preferences to various posts advertised. In the said advertisement an identical clause was inserted, which reads as follows:

> "*If a candidate is selected in the main list on the basis of the higher priority of post given by him in the preference sheet, he/she will not be considered for the remaining post(s) of preference sheet.*"

While considering the said clause, the Hon'ble Apex court has made the following observations at paragraph Nos.14 and 20:

> *"14. From the facts narrated above and the contentions put forth by the learned counsel for the parties, it is evident that though several posts were advertised and the applications were sought from the eligible candidates, the preliminary and written examination was common and the marks as obtained in the said examination was taken into consideration to include the candidates based on merit to the post for which the candidate concerned had given his preference. The advertisement had indicated the*

[3] (2021) 18 SCC 61

requirement of the Rule that a candidate who had preferred the higher of the posts which has been advertised would be selected against such post depending on the merit in the examination. To that extent Rule 4(3)(c)(2) of Rules 2015 noted above is clear and specific that the category-wise recommendation of the candidates will be made according to the marks obtained by them and the preference sheet submitted by the candidate. Clause (2) of sub-rule (3) further clarifies that if a candidate is selected in the main list on the basis of the higher priority of the post given by him in the preference sheet, the candidate will not be considered for the remaining post indicated in the preference sheet.

20. In the present facts and circumstances, the Rule concerned provides for a definite process, which was also depicted in the advertisement calling for applications. The Rule is not under challenge. The candidate concerned had applied without demur and also furnished a declaration with regard to correctness of details provided. He cannot thereafter turn around to seek alteration of the position to the detriment of others."

34. In the above referred judgment, the Hon'ble Apex Court has considered the identical provision which was inserted in the advertisement and clearly directed that once a definite process was stipulated in the advertisement and the same was not under challenge, the candidate cannot thereafter turn around to seek alteration of the position to the detriment of others. In the instant

case, the selections were made based on the options exercised by the participants and accordingly, selections were finalized and if the cases of the petitioners were considered contrary to their preferences, they seek alteration of selected candidates which is not permissible according to the observations made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the above referred judgment.

35. The notification was issued based on the statutory rules and after commencement or completion of the selection process, the said process cannot be changed or deviated. In support of his contention, he also placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Tej Prakash Pathak v. Rajasthan High Court***[4]**,** wherein it was held at paragraph Nos.14, 24, 35, 65.4 and 65.5 as follows:

> *"**14.** In various judicial pronouncements, the law governing recruitment to public services has been colloquially termed as 'the rules of the game'. The 'game' is the process of selection and appointment. Courts have consistently frowned upon tinkering with the rules of the game once the recruitment process commences. This has crystallised into an oft-quoted legal phrase that "the rules of the game must not be changed mid-way, or after the game has been played". Broadly- speaking these rules fall in two categories.*

[4] (2025) 2 SCC 1

One which prescribes the eligibility criteria (i.e., essential qualifications) of the candidates seeking employment; and the other which stipulates the method and manner of making the selection from amongst the eligible candidates.

24. *The principle of fairness in action requires that public authorities be held accountable for their representations. Good administration requires public authorities to act in a predictable manner and honour the promises made or practices established unless there is good reason not to do so*[5]*.*

35. *The discernible ratio in* ***K. Manjusree v. State of A.P.****,*[6] *is that the criterion for selection is not to be changed after completion of the selection process, though in absence of rules to the contrary the Selection Committee may fix minimum marks either for written examination or for interview for the purposes of selection. But if such minimum marks are fixed, it must be done before commencement of selection process. This view has been followed by another three-Judge Bench of this Court in* ***Ramesh Kumar v. High Court of Delhi***[7] *wherein the law on the issue has been summarized thus:*

> *"15. … in case the statutory rules prescribe a particular mode of selection, it has to be given strict adherence accordingly. In case, no procedure is prescribed by the rules and there is no other impediment in law, the competent authority while laying down the norms for selection may*

---

[5] *Sivanandan C.T. v. High Court of Kerala, (2024) 3 SCC 799*
[6] (2008) 3 SCC 512
[7] (2010) 3 SCC 104

prescribe for the tests and further specify the minimum benchmarks for written tests as well as for viva voce."

65.4. *Recruiting bodies, subject to the extant Rules, may devise appropriate procedure for bringing the recruitment process to its logical end provided the procedure so adopted is transparent, non-discriminatory/ non- arbitrary and has a rational nexus to the object sought to be achieved.*

65.5. *Extant Rules having statutory force are binding on the recruiting body both in terms of procedure and eligibility. However, where the Rules are non-existent, or silent, administrative instructions may fill in the gaps."*

36. In terms of the above, it is made clear that principle of fairness is required on the public authorities and they are accountable for their representations and once the statutory rules prescribe a particular mode of selection, the authorities have to be given strict adherence to the said process and selections have to be completed in its logical end in terms of the rules. Here also, the authorities have scrupulously followed the statutory rules as well as the terms indicated in the notification.

37. Finally, he placed reliance on the observations made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Anurag Kumar Singh v. State of Uttarakhand***[8]**,** wherein it was held at paragraph No.16 as follows:

[8] (2016) 9 SCC 426

"*16. Judicial discretion can be exercised by a Court only when there are two or more possible lawful solutions. In any event, Courts cannot give any direction contrary to the Statute or Rules made thereunder in exercise of judicial discretion. It will be useful to reproduce from Judicial Discretion (1989) by Aharon Barak which is as follows:*

> *"Discretion assumes the freedom to choose among several lawful alternatives. Therefore, discretion does not exist when there is but one lawful option. In this situation, the judge is required to select that option and has no freedom of choice. No discretion is involved in the choice between a lawful act and an unlawful act. The judge must choose the lawful act, and he is precluded from choosing the unlawful act. Discretion, on the other hand, assumes the lack of an obligation to choose one particular possibility among several."*

38. As per the above observations, the Court clearly directed that judicial discretion ought not to be exercised where there is only one possible solution and the Court cannot give directions contrary to the statute or the rules made thereunder. In the instant case, Rule 10 of the Rules, 2025 clearly demonstrates that the options exercised in the online application shall be final and once a candidate is selected for a post based on the preference given, he/she will not be considered for any other post and the same was confirmed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in identical matter in ***Madhya Pradesh Public Service***

Commission's case (supra 3). But, surprisingly, the learned Single Judge without considering the said aspects has allowed the writ petitions with a direction to consider the case of the petitioners for the post of School Assistant which is not only contrary to the rules but also the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex court in the above referred judgments.

39. Sri G.V.S.Kishore Kumar, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, has contended that the request made by the petitioners is in terms of Rule 3(iii) of the Rules, 2025 where the method of recruitment specifies that the recruitment shall be purely based on merit-cum-roster system and also Rule 10(iii) clause (d) specifies that the allotment of posts to the selected candidates shall be made subject to merit-cum-roster and vacancy position. In terms of the above rule, all the petitioners are entitled for appointment to the post of School Assistant based on their merit-cum-roster and vacancy position. But, for the reasons best known, without considering the case of the petitioners for the post of School Assistant based on their merit-cum-roster, they have considered and appointed to the post of Secondary Grade Teacher denying the higher post of School Assistant. The exercise of options is only a procedural fact which

cannot be taken into consideration for making appointments based on merit. Merit always plays a crucial role in selection process. Admittedly, all the petitioners are meritorious and accordingly, they are all entitled for consideration to the post of School Assistant instead of considering their cases for Secondary Grade Teachers. In fact, they have paid the application fee separately and they have also made applications separately and applied for different posts. Hence, they are entitled for consideration of the post in terms of the merit and roster. As the petitioners have made a request/direction to the authorities to consider their cases in terms of the Rules more specifically Rule 3(iii) and Rule 10(iii)(d) of the Rules, 2025. Hence, there is no necessity to challenge the Rules. The same was considered by the learned Single Judge in his judgment in paragraph Nos.23, 24, 26, 29 and 34, which read as follows:

> *"23. The Selection Committee is common for the posts claimed by the Petitioners. Rule 3 as extracted above states that Merit cum Roster would be the sole criterion for recruitment, while Rule 10 states that order of preference would be the criterion. If the order of preference in Rule 10 is considered absolute, the Rule 3 would effectively become a dead provision. Alternatively, Rule 3 does not specify anything about merit cum roster in the order of preference as*

was sought to be contended. In that sense, there is a conflict in both the Rules regarding the method of appointment and these Rules have to be reconciled.

24. In ***Southern Motors v. State of Karnataka***[9]*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was considering conflict of provisions, Karnataka VAT Rules proviso to Rule 3(2)(C) with other provisions of the Act and Rules. The conflicting provision was read down to make it in consonance with the other provisions after referring to case law on interpretation of statutes. The relevant portion of the Judgment is extracted below;*

> ***"34.*** *In the same vein, the following passage from* ***Doypack Systems (P) Ltd. v. Union of India****23 was adverted to : (Tata Steel Ltd. case21, SCC p. 160, para 24)*
>
> *"24. … '58. The words in the statute must, prima facie, be given their ordinary meanings. Where the grammatical construction is clear and manifest and without doubt, that construction ought to prevail unless there are some strong and obvious reasons to the contrary. Nothing has been shown to warrant that literal construction should not be given effect to. See Chandavarkar Sita Ratna Rao v. Ashalata S. Guram24 approving Halsbury's Laws of England, 4th Edn., para 856 at p. 552, Nokes v. Doncaster Amalgamated Collieries Ltd. It must be emphasised that interpretation must be in consonance with the directive principles of State policy in Articles 39(b) and (c) of the Constitution.*
>
> *59. It has to be reiterated that the object of interpretation of a statute is to discover the intention of Parliament as expressed in the Act. The dominant purpose in construing a statute is to ascertain the intention of the legislature as expressed in the statute, considering it as a whole and in its context. That intention, and therefore the meaning of the statute, is*

[9] (2017) 3 SCC 467

primarily to be sought in the words used in the statute itself, which must, if they are plain and unambiguous, be applied as they stand.' (Doypack Systems case23, SCC pp. 331-32, paras 58-59)"

***35.** The following excerpts from Tata Steel Ltd.21, being of formidable significance are also extracted as hereunder : (SCC pp. 161-62, paras 25-27)*

"25. In this regard, reference to Mahadeo Prasad Bais v. ITO26 would be absolutely seemly. In the said case, it has been held that an interpretation which will result in an anomaly or absurdity should be avoided and where literal construction creates an anomaly, absurdity and discrimination, statute should be liberally construed even slightly straining the language so as to avoid the meaningless anomaly. Emphasis has been laid on the principle that if an interpretation leads to absurdity, it is the duty of the court to avoid the same.

*26. In **Oxford University Press v. CIT**27, Mohapatra, J. has opined that interpretation should serve the intent and purpose of the statutory provision. In that context, the learned Judge has referred to the authority in State of T.N. v. Kodaikanal Motor Union (P) Ltd.28 wherein this Court after referring to K.P. Varghese v. ITO14 and Luke v. IRC19 has observed : (Oxford University Press case27, SCC p. 376, para 33)*

'33. … "17. The courts must always seek to find out the intention of the legislature. Though the courts must find out the intention of the statute from the language used, but language more often than not is an imperfect instrument of expression of human thought. As Lord Denning said16 it would be idle to expect every statutory provision to be drafted with divine prescience and perfect clarity. As Judge Learned Hand said, we must not make a fortress out of dictionary but remember that statutes must have some purpose or object, whose imaginative discovery is judicial craftsmanship. We need not always cling to literalness and should seek to endeavour to avoid an unjust or absurd result. We should not make a mockery of legislation. To make sense out of an unhappily worded provision, where the purpose is apparent to the judicial eye "some" violence

to language is permissible.(Kodaikanal Motor Union case28, SCC p. 100, para 17)'"

27. Sabharwal, J. (as his Lordship then was) has observed thus : (Oxford University Press case27, SCC p. 384, para 58)

'58. … It is well-recognised rule of construction that a statutory provision must be so construed, if possible, that absurdity and mischief may be avoided. It was held that construction suggested on behalf of the Revenue would lead to a wholly unreasonable result which could never have been intended by the legislature. It was said that the literalness in the interpretation of Section 52(2) must be eschewed and the court should try to arrive at an interpretation which avoids the absurdity and the mischief and makes the provision rational, sensible, unless of course, the hands of the court are tied and it cannot find any escape from the tyranny of literal interpretation. It is said that it is now well-settled rule of construction that where the plain literal interpretation of a statutory provision produces a manifestly absurd and unjust result which could never have been intended by the legislature, the court may modify the language used by the legislature or even "do some violence" to it, so as to achieve the obvious intention of the legislature and produce a rational construction. In such a case the court may read into the statutory provision a condition which, though not expressed, is implicit in construing the basic assumption underlying the statutory provision.'"

***36.** As would be overwhelmingly pellucid from hereinabove, though words in a statute must, to start with, be extended their ordinary meanings, **but if the literal construction thereof results in anomaly or absurdity, the courts must seek to find out the underlying intention of the legislature and in the said pursuit, can within permissible limits strain the language so as to avoid such unintended mischief.**"*

26. The primary purpose of public notification for recruitment to various posts under different managements is to ensure transparency and select the most meritorious

candidates. In the face of this conflict in Rule 3 and Rule 10, the Rule that advances the very purpose of recruitment, i.e., merit, should be adopted and any contrary interpretation would be anti-merit and such an interpretation should be avoided. The Rule that is anti-merit should be read down.

29. In ***Anmol Kumar Tiwari and Ors v. State of Jharkhand***[10]*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court went further and held that the appointment of less meritorious individuals would violate Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India. Paragraph 10 thereof is extracted below;*

> *"10. The second issue relates to the claim of the intervenors in the Writ Petitions for appointment. There is no doubt that selections to public employment should be on the basis of merit.* ***Appointment of persons with lesser merit ignoring those who have secured more marks would be in violation of the Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.****"*

34. Ideally, the order of preference should be sought after the results so that the candidate is better informed. At the time of application, no individual can be sure of the marks and rank to be secured in the examination. An uninformed preference can never be a ground to restrain a candidate from making an informed preference. The binding nature of a provision on the candidate is only when the preference is conscious and on an informed basis, notwithstanding the language employed in the provision."

---

[10] *(LL 2021 SC 102)*

40. As per the above observations of the learned Single Judge, he has rightly considered and directed the authorities to consider the case of the petitioners as per their merit rank for appointment in respective subjects to the post of School Assistant. The learned counsel further submitted that in fact as per the Union Public Service Commission (UPSC) notification, the UPSC would provide 10 days time after the declaration of result for exercise of cadre preference from the qualified candidates and in fact it also provides 15 days time from the date of declaration of result of written part of Civil Services (Main) Examination to the candidates qualified to update their options/preferences. But, here, the said option was silent. Accordingly, the relevance made by the petitioners on UPSC Rules and notification is not applicable to the instant cases.

41. Smt. Kavitha Gottipati, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, supplemented her arguments stating that Rule 10(b) of the Rules, 2025 says that if a candidate is offered for multiple options, order of preference will be considered during selection and allotment process i.e., pertaining to one cadre of post. The same cannot be applied for consideration of the petitioners' case in different categories. If the candidates made

an option for one particular post in one category, their cases should be considered only for that particular post but, if they have made applications for different categories of post, they should be considered based on their merit-cum-roster and not in accordance with the options.

42. Considering the rival submissions and on perusal of the record, in our opinion Rule 3(iii) of the Rules, 2025 would be attracted only after short listing the applications based on Rule 10(iii)(b) of the Rules, 2025 and the said provision cannot be transposed to be made applicable to the criteria for short listing of candidates to be appointed.

43. After going through the record, this Court directed the appellants/respondents to file an additional affidavit only with regard to process of selection undertaken by the authorities. Based on the said directions, the Joint Director, TET-cum-TRT and Convener, Andhra Pradesh District Selection Committee-2025, Recruitment (AP DSC), Vidyabhavan, Mangalagiri, has filed an affidavit. According to the above affidavit, out of 16,347 posts a total of 5,77,675 applications were received and for that they have conducted examination in 154 centres and after that a

grievance cell was opened and 33,830 grievances were received from 20.04.2025 to 23.09.2025 and finally, merit list was prepared and declared based on merit, roster, horizontal reservation and availability of vacancies and choice of options/preferences on 1:1 basis.

44. In fact, though reply is filed by the respondents/petitioners to the said affidavit, the same is of no relevance, as they have only stated that the selections were made based on the prescribed procedure and they have prepared the selections based on merit-cum-roster and vacancy position taking the options into consideration.

45. Admittedly, on perusal of the above, it clearly indicates that a total of 5,77,675 applications have been received. Hence, while narrowing down the selections, based on the preferences exercised by the candidates, they made selections in terms of the Rule 10(iii) of the Rules, 2025.

46. Such construction otherwise is not called out from the scheme contained in the Rules. The process of short listing as adopted by the appellants is extremely important for them considering the lakhs of candidates applied for the post. Hence,

it is a settled principle of law that dilution of fresh claims is not permissible. Any procedure that is transparent/non-discriminatory/ non-arbitrary having a rational nexus to the object sought to be achieved may be devised for conducting recruitment process towards its logical end by its recruiting bodies. As in the instant case, lakhs of applications have been received and for narrowing down the respondents have followed the procedure contemplated under Rule 10(iii) of the Rules, 2025 as per the preferences/options exercised by the participants/candidates. They have short listed the same according to their merit and roster and the same is applied uniformly to all the candidates without any discrimination.

47. The exception was taken by the learned Single Judge to the methodology adopted by the appellants in short listing the candidates for appointment in terms of the Rule 10(iii)(b)(c) and (f) of the Rules, 2025. Since the learned Single Judge did not declare Rule 10(iii) of the Rules, 2025 as ultra vires to the Constitution and to decide whether the learned Single Judge was correct in directing the appellants to appoint the petitioners contrary to Rule 10(iii) (b)(c) and (f) of the Rules, 2025. Answer should be negative.

48. The law is well settled that a presumption to constitutionality in favour of a statute. Without there being any pleadings to show in what manner there is repugnancy between the two provisions and without challenge to the statutory rules, no such repugnancy can be presumed. In the instant case, the candidates would be considered for the post as they have preferred based on the merit. In that manner the list would be finalized simultaneously for all the different posts and different managements advertised in the notification. In the said circumstances, when the petitioners preferred the post as Secondary Grade Teacher based on the marks secured and accordingly, they were appointed and cannot thereafter turn around to seek appointment in the next preferred post when already persons eligible were considered based on the merit for the said post. The recruiting bodies subject to the extant rules may process the selection to its logical end. In the instant case, considering the disproportionate number of applications received against the different posts in different managements, the methodology adopted by the recruiting agency to narrow down the selection process is perfectly consistent with the Rules, more specifically Rule 10(iii)(a)(b)(c) and (f) of the Rules, 2025. On

perusal of the statutory rules and also the procedure followed by the recruiting authorities and considering the number of applications received and participated in the selection process, when there was no deviation to the rules and selection process, we are of the firm opinion that the Court should not interfere with the same and if any directions are given, the same would affect the selections which were already made based on the rules and advertisement.

49. Viewed in the said angle, we are of the considered opinion that the direction given by the learned Single Judge is contrary to the statutory rules more specifically Rule 10(iii)(a) to (f) of the Rules, 2025 and the notification dated 20.04.2025. Hence, the impugned orders dated 07.01.2026 in W.P.Nos.25763, 25744, 26312, 27843, 26323, 28655, 24771, 25501 & 26700 of 2025 and the impugned orders dated 29.12.2025 in W.P.Nos.23243 and 23487 of 2025 passed by the learned Single Judge are hereby set aside.

50. Accordingly, all the Writ Appeals are allowed. Consequently, all the Writ Petitions are dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

JUSTICE D.RAMESH

JUSTICE A.HARI HARANADHA SARMA

Date: 16.10.2026
Ivd

Whether the order is:

Speaking	No	Reasoned	Yes
Reportable	No	Non-reportable	Yes

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D.RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE A.HARI HARANADHA SARMA

WRIT APPEAL Nos.658, 362, 404, 580, 582, 583, 585, 606, 613, 615 & 652 of 2026

and

WRIT PETITION Nos.1908, 1912 and 9778 of 2026

Dated: 16.10.2026

Ivd