APHC010557402026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

Bench Sr.Nos:- 8, 12-15 [3584]

WRIT PETITION NO: 30492 of 2026 along with W.P.Nos.30153, 30157, 30163 & 30514 of 2026

1) W.P.No.30492 of 2026:

Shaik Bushra Ahmed ...Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Andhra Pradesh and others ...Respondents

2) W.P.No.30153 of 2026:

M. V. V. Prasad ...Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Andhra Pradesh and another ...Respondents

3) W.P.No.30157 of 2026:

Ms. Satyala Anjanapriya ...Petitioner

Vs.

The High Court of Andhra Pradesh and others ...Respondents

4) W.P.No.30163 of 2026:

K. Pulla Rao and 5 others ...Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Andhra Pradesh and others ...Respondents

5) W.P.No.30514 of 2026:

Damarla Sudha Bhuvaneswari and 14 others ...Petitioner

Vs.

High Court of Andhra Pradesh and another ...Respondents

****

CORAM : THE CHIEF JUSTICE LISA GILL
SRI JUSTICE CHALLA GUNARANJAN

DATE : 16th October 2026

Present :

Advocate for Petitioners	:	Mr. K. Ravi, Sr. Counsel with Mr. Munduru Eswar Brahmanand - W.P.No.30514 of 2026 Mr. Tagore Yadav Yaragorla - W.P.No.30492 of 2026 Mr. Kondeti Soma Sekhar - W.P.No.30157 of 2026 Mr. Srinivasa Rao Narra - W.P.No.30163 of 2026
Advocate for Respondents	:	Mr. Y. N. Vivekananda, Standing Counsel for High Court of Andhra Pradesh

LISA GILL, CJ.

All these writ petitions are taken up together for hearing and adjudication, at request and with consent of all learned counsel for parties, as an identical question is raised for consideration in all writ petitions. Petitioners in all writ petitions are law graduates who have attained their law degrees within a period of one year preceding issuance of notification, dated 25.09.2026, issued by High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amaravati, for inviting applications for 119 posts of Civil Judges (Junior Division). All the petitioners are ineligible to apply for the same as per said notification, not having completed the period of one year from obtaining their law degree/ provisional enrolment with the State Bar Council.

2. Issue raised for consideration in these petitions is

"whether Clause II (A) (a) of notification, dated 25.09.2026, issued for inviting applications for recruitment to post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) in Andhra Pradesh State Judicial Service, is liable to be set aside to the extent it is provided therein that law graduates who have obtained law degree preceding one year as on the date of notification only, are eligible to apply for above said post, being in contravention of judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***Bhumika Trust Vs Union of India and others***[1]";

or, in other words,

"whether a law graduate, who has not yet completed one year from graduation/ provisional enrolment with concerned State Bar Council, till date of notification, dated 25.09.2026, is eligible/entitled to apply for recruitment to post of Civil Judge (Junior Division), as per directions of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***Bhumika Trust*** (supra)".

3. Learned counsel of parties are ad idem that reference to individual facts of all writ petitions is not required as it is an admitted fact that all petitioners in these writ petitions have secured their law graduation degrees within the preceding one year of notification dated 25.09.2026. The month and year in which petitioners in these writ petitions have attained their law degrees; and dates of provisional enrolment/registration with concerned State Bar Council as on record are as under:

[1] 2026 SCC OnLine SC 1687

Sl. No.	Writ Petition No.	Petitioners	Law Degree obtained	Year of passing Law Degree	Dates of provisional enrolment/ registration with concerned State Bar Council
1	30153/2026	M.V.V.Prasad	LL.B.	February 2026	04.07.2026
2	30157/2026	Satyala Anjanapriya	B.A.LL.B.	July 2026	25.07.2026
3	30163/2026	Kojja Pulla Rao	-	April 2026	25.07.2026
4		Shaik Arifa	LL.B.	April 2026	25.07.2026
5		Gopisetty Satya Geethika	B.A.LL.B.	April 2026	25.07.2026
6		Sudanagunta Manaswini	B.A.LL.B.	April 2026	25.07.2026
7		Mundra Narendra	LL.B.	April 2026	12.09.2026
8		Vempati Venkata Naga Mani Deepika	LL.B.	April 2026	12.09.2026
9	30492/2026	Shaik Bushra Ahmed	LL.B.	October 2025	20.06.2026
10	30514/2026	Damarla Sudha Bhuvaneswari	B.A.LL.B.	April 2026	20.06.2026
11		Parimi Akshitha Bhanu	B.A.LL.B.	August 2026	Not on record
12		Vanapalli Sri Pravallika	B.A.LL.B.	June 2026	Not on record
13		Dandamudi Tapaswinaag	-	Arrayed as petitioner but no certificate on record	Not on record
14		Sai Shriya Potla	B.A.LL.B.	June 2026	Not on record
15		Dharavthu Suvarchana Bai	-	June 2026	20.06.2026
16		Pokala Neha	B.A.LL.B.	April 2026	20.06.2026
17		Tholpunuri Sindhuja Goud	B.A.LL.B.	August 2026	Not on record
18		Jangili Ushaswi	-	August 2026	Not on record
19		Pujari Dharani	B.A.LL.B.	August 2026	Not on record

20		Tamma Kusumanjali	-	June 2026	Not on record
21		Chalamalasetti Lakshmi Naga Sai	B.B.A.LL.B.	June 2026	Not on record
22		Palepu Himaja	-	September 2026	12.09.2026
23		Kinjarapu Deepak Naidu	B.A.LL.B.	July 2026	08.08.2026
24		Gayathri Lakkamalla	B.A.LL.B.	April 2026	04.07.2026

Dates of provisional enrolment/registration with concerned State Bar Council are not available for some petitioners. The same, in any case, would not be of any relevance, as admittedly all petitioners have graduated within the year preceding notification dated 25.9.2026.

4. Learned counsel are further ad idem that there is no requirement for filing of counter(s) in matters as factual matrix is not in dispute.

5. Brief facts necessary for adjudication of this matter are that notification, dated 25.09.2026, was issued for inviting applications for recruitment to post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) in Andhra Pradesh State Judicial Service. Clause II (A) (a) of said notification reads as under:

> ***"(A) <u>DIRECT RECRUITMENT</u>:***
>
> *(a) All Law graduates who have obtained Law Degree preceding one year as on the date of Notification are eligible to appear for Civil Judge (Junior Division) Notification issued for the year 2026.*
>
> ***[As per the Judgment in Bhumika Trust Vs Union of India and others, in Writ Petition (Civil) No.1110/2025, dated 21.08.2026 of the Hon'ble***

Supreme Court of India, and pending amendments to the Andhra Pradesh State Judicial (Service and Cadre) Rules, 2026]"

6. Learned counsel for petitioners vehemently argued that this condition of limiting applications by law graduates who have obtained law degree preceding one year, thereby excluding all law graduates who have secured the degree within this one year till date of notification, is in direct violation of specific directions of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***Bhumika Trust*** (supra). It is submitted that Hon'ble the Supreme Court specifically considered the difficulty faced by law graduates by sudden restoration of requirement of three years' practice for being eligible to apply for post in question and it is, in these circumstances, that Hon'ble the Supreme Court, while considering review petitions in the case of ***Bhumika Trust*** (supra), modified its directions issued on 20.05.2025 in ***All India Judges Association and others Vs. Union of India and others*** (W.P.(C) No.1022 of 1989)[2].

7. Mr. K. Ravi, learned Senior Counsel appearing for petitioner in W.P.No.30514 of 2026, submitted that it is specifically mentioned in the case of ***Bhumika Trust*** (supra) that "all law graduates" shall be eligible to apply, notwithstanding three-year practice requirement. While referring to para 73 of decision in ***Bhumika Trust*** case, it is strenuously urged that compulsory period of one year intensive training at concerned State Judicial Academy has to be treated as equivalent to one year of practice at Bar for the purpose of

[2] 2025 (11) SCC 233

three-year requirement. It is, thus, argued that a combined reading of sub-paras (i), (ii), (iv) & (v) of para 73 leads to a clear-cut conclusion that all law graduates, irrespective of non-completion of period of one year from date of graduation till date of notification, are eligible to apply for post of Civil Judge (Junior Division). The very purpose for which Hon'ble the Supreme Court has modified its order, dated 20.05.2025, is being set to naught by way of insertion of Clause II (A) (a) in notification, dated 25.09.2026.

8. He further submits that, as per Rule 12(3)(a) of Andhra Pradesh State and Subordinate Service Rules, 1996, petitioners possess the academic and other qualifications prescribed for said post, therefore, denying them opportunity to submit their applications for said post is illegal and arbitrary on the ground that they have not completed a period of one year since graduation. As a special concession, all law graduates have been permitted by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in ***Bhumika Trust*** (supra) to apply for said post, irrespective of whether they have completed this one year period before notification or not as a one time measure, and that, as per ***Bhumika Trust*** verdict, such law graduates are 'deemed' to have completed this period and no Certificate of Practice is also required to be submitted. It is argued that, in this scenario, it is not open to respondent to insist upon the candidates having completed one year from graduation till date of notification.

9. Mr. Tagore Yadav Yaragorla, learned counsel for petitioner in W.P.No.30492 of 2026; Mr. Kondeti Soma Sekhar, learned counsel for

petitioner in W.P.No.30157 of 2026; Mr. Srinivasa Rao Narra, learned counsel for petitioners in W.P.No.30163 of 2026, have argued on the same lines with equal vehemence. It is thus prayed that all these writ petitions be allowed as prayed for.

10. Mr. Y. N. Vivekananda, learned Standing Counsel representing High Court of Andhra Pradesh, has opposed these writ petitions, while submitting that impugned clause in notification, dated 25.02.2026, has been correctly inserted in complete compliance and consonance of judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***Bhumika Trust*** (supra). It is denied that there is any exemption afforded to candidates from one year of practice before applying for post of Civil Judge (Junior Division). Directions issued by Hon'ble the Supreme Court cannot be stretched in any manner to include candidates like present petitioners who have not yet completed one year from their graduation till issuance of notification, dated 25.09.2026. The concession given by Hon'ble the Supreme Court is that candidates who have completed one year since graduation till date of notification need not submit a Certificate of Practice for this period. Dismissal of writ petitions is thus sought.

11. We have heard learned counsel for parties at length and have perused the files carefully with their able assistance.

12. It is a matter of record that question regarding the number of years of practice at Bar as a qualification for post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) and others, has engaged the attention of Hon’ble the Supreme Court

since long. It had been the subject matter of consideration before Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***All India Judges Association Vs. Union of India and others***[3] decided on 24.08.1993, also referred to as second ***All India Judges Association*** (for short, 'Second AIJA') case. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in its decision in review petition No.249 of 1992 and a batch of connected review petitions arising from W.P.(C) No.1022 of 1989 considered the question regarding minimum period of practice at Bar which ought to be prescribed as eligibility requirement for appointment to post of Civil Judge (Junior Division). It was directed by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in second ***AIJA*** case that three years' practice as a lawyer be prescribed as an essential qualification for recruitment as judicial officer at the lower rung.

13. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in ***All India Judges Association and others Vs. Union of India***[4] decided on 21.03.2002, also referred to as third ***AIJA*** case, considered recommendations of Shetty Commission and other aspects to ultimately direct removal of mandatory three-year rule and direct that fresh law graduates be permitted to enter judicial service, while emphasizing the need for intensive training after recruitment.

14. Subsequently, Hon'ble the Supreme Court was again called upon to consider a number of issues regarding eligibility conditions for entry in judicial service, which included the question whether the condition of three years' service, which was done away with by third ***AIJA*** case, needs to be

[3] 1993 (4) SCC 288
[4] 2002 (4) SCC 247

restored. Hon'ble the Supreme Court, in its decision dated 20.05.2025, in the case of ***All India Judges Association and others Vs. Union of India and others***[5], among other issues, reconsidered the issue regarding requirement of practice at Bar for recruitment to post of Civil Judge (Junior Division). It was directed that candidates desirous of applying for post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) must have practice for a period of minimum three years to be eligible for said examination. Relevant directions as contained in para 89 are reproduced as hereunder:

> *"(vii) All the High Courts and the State Governments in the country shall amend the relevant service rules to the effect that candidates desirous of appearing in the examination for the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) must have practiced for a minimum period of 3 years to be eligible for the said examination. To fulfill the said requirement, the Rules shall mandate that the candidate produces a certificate to that effect duly certified either by the Principal Judicial Officer of that Court or by an advocate of that Court having a minimum standing of 10 years duly endorsed by the Principal Judicial Officer of such a District or a Principal Judicial Officer at such a station. Insofar as the candidates who are practicing before the High Courts or this Court, they shall be certified by an advocate who has a minimum standing of 10 years duly endorsed by an officer designated by that High Court or this Court. We further direct that the experience of the candidates which they have gained while working as Law Clerks with any of the Judges or Judicial Officers in the country should also be considered while calculating their total number of years of practice. The Rules shall also mandate that the candidates who are appointed to the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) pursuant to their selection through the examination must compulsorily undergo at least 1 year of training before presiding in a Court;*
>
> *(viii) It is directed that the number of years of practice completed by a candidate desirous of appearing in the examination for the post of Civil Judge*

[5] 2025 (11) SCC 233

(Junior Division) be calculated from the date of their provisional enrolment/registration with the concerned State Bar Council;

(ix) It is further directed that the said requirement of minimum years of practice shall not be applicable in cases where the concerned High Court has already initiated the selection process for the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) prior to the date of this judgment and shall be applicable only from the next recruitment process; and

(x) All the amendments in terms of the aforesaid directions shall be carried out by the High Courts within a period of three months from the date of this judgment and the concerned State Governments shall consider and approve the same within a further period of three months."

15. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in above said ***AIJA*** case, in its decision, dated 20.05.2025, further directed that all recruitment processes, which had been kept in abeyance, in view of pendency of said proceedings, shall proceed in accordance with rules which were applicable on the date of advertisement(s) / notification(s).

16. Subsequent thereto, review petitions/clarification petitions were filed in respect to requirement of minimum three years' practice at Bar mandated as an eligibility criteria to be considered for appointment to post of Civil Judge (Junior Division). The batch of matters, which were before Hon'ble the Supreme Court as decided in the case of ***Bhumika Trust*** (supra), were categorized by it as under:

"(i) Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1110/2025, filed by the NGO-Petitioner, seeking clarification as to the interplay of the Judgment under Review and the Judgment in ***In Re: Recruitment of Visually Impaired in Judicial Services****;*

(ii) Three Review Petitions against the Judgment under Review, seeking recall of the directions insofar as they relate to the mandatory eligibility criteria of 3 years' practice at the Bar;

(iii) I.A. Nos.336090 and 336091/2025 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 1022/1989, seeking directions that the period spent for higher education in law ought to be also counted towards the 3 years' practice requirement."

17. Hon'ble the Supreme Court, after considering contentions of parties and suggestions/ opinions received from various High Courts, Law Universities/National Law Schools and learned Amicus Curiae, concluded that judgment under review did not require reconsideration upon the fundamental question of requirement of three years' practice, as prior exposure to working of courts is desirable for a person seeking to enter into judicial service. A limited intervention was caused by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in order to minimize the hardship caused to recent law graduates by sudden restoration of requirement of three years' practice; to provide a structured and workable mechanism for implementation of said requirement without uncertainty or artificial exclusion; and to ensure that judicial service continues to attract meritorious young persons.

18. While delineating on nature of exercise undertaken by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in review petitions, it was specifically held as under:

"60. We therefore consider that the present exercise should not be understood as questioning the wisdom of prescribing three years of practice. Rather, it is an exercise in ensuring that the rule is implemented in a manner which is fair to those affected by its sudden restoration, which gives sufficient time for the legal and professional ecosystem to adjust to

the new requirement, and which does not unnecessarily narrow the field from which the subordinate judiciary may draw its future members.

.....

63. These circumstances, taken together, persuade us that a limited intervention is warranted. We reiterate that we are not substituting our assessment for that of the Bench which rendered the Judgment under Review on the desirability of practical experience. Nor are we holding that the three-year requirement is inherently unreasonable. The intervention which we consider necessary is narrower and is directed to its enforcement and implementation.

64. The immediate object therefore must be threefold: first, to minimise the hardship caused to fresh and recent law graduates by the sudden restoration of the requirement; second, to provide a structured and workable mechanism through which the requirement can be implemented without uncertainty or artificial exclusion; and third, to ensure that the judicial service continues to attract meritorious young persons who may otherwise be lost to other branches of the legal profession or public service.

65. The first of these considerations requires a transitional arrangement. More than a year has now elapsed since the Judgment under Review restored the three-year requirement. During this period, candidates have remained uncertain about their eligibility, while recruitment processes have been affected by the pendency of these proceedings. In these circumstances, it would serve little purpose to subject fresh graduates to the full rigour of a rule whose application they could not have reasonably anticipated when they pursued their legal education. In view of this, a defined period is necessary so that the legal profession, the recruiting authorities and prospective candidates are all placed on notice of the regime that will govern future recruitment.

66. We may safely presume that, during the preceding one year, most law graduates would have either engaged in practice at the Bar, served as Law Clerks to Hon'ble Judges, or gained experience in law firms. As a one-time measure, such experience may reasonably be treated at par with one year of practice at the Bar.

19. Hon’ble the Supreme Court held that the requirement of experience and requirement of training are not mutually exclusive and in fact can be complementary. While taking note of the fact that initial practice at Bar exposes a candidate to adversarial process, judicial training would prepare the candidate for a fundamentally different responsibility of adjudication, it was held that candidates, who are permitted to enter selection process during transitional period, should not be placed in the field immediately upon selection and that their appointment would initially be to the status of trainee judicial officers and independent judicial functions would follow after their having undergone an appropriate period of institutional training. A structured framework for requirement of completion of three years’ active practice was laid down by Hon’ble the Supreme Court.

20. After taking note that during the preceding one year most law graduates would have engaged in practice at Bar, or served as Law Clerks to Hon'ble judges, or gained experience in law firms, it was directed ‘as a one-time measure’ that such experience may be treated at par with one year of practice at Bar. No exemption of completing this one year of practice is provided. Hon'ble the Supreme Court then proceeded to set out the specific framework of training to be imparted after induction in service for a period of two years. One-year of structured training at concerned State Judicial Academy and structured law clerkship for second year, after induction in service was detailed and following directions were given in respect to

transitional period, that is for notification(s)/ advertisement(s) issued for recruitment after judgment under review i.e. from 20.05.2025 up to 31.03.2027:

> *"73. In light of the above discussion, we consider it appropriate to issue the following directions, which would apply to all recruitment notification/advertisement(s) issued to the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) in the transitional period, i.e., notification/advertisement(s) issued after the Judgment under Review up to 31.03.2027:*
>
> *(i) All law graduates shall be eligible to apply, notwithstanding the three-year practice requirement. Having regard to the fact that more than one year has elapsed since the Judgment under Review was pronounced, such candidates shall, for the purposes of their applications, be deemed to have completed one year of active practice. They shall not be required to furnish a separate Certificate of Practice in support of the said deemed period;*
>
> *(ii) Candidates selected pursuant to the aforesaid recruitment shall, upon appointment, be designated as "Trainee Judicial Officers" and shall undergo a compulsory period of one year of intensive training at the concerned State Judicial Academy. This period shall be treated as equivalent to one year of practice at the Bar for the purposes of the three-year requirement;*
>
> *(iii) During the period of such training, the Trainee Judicial Officers shall be paid a fixed emolument equivalent to onehalf of the remuneration payable to a Judicial Magistrate First Class in the concerned State. They shall, in addition, be entitled to the facilities and other benefits ordinarily made available to trainees at the concerned State Judicial Academy;*
>
> *(iv) Upon successful completion of the aforesaid training, the Trainee Judicial Officers shall undergo a further period of one year of structured Law Clerkship. The first six months shall be spent as a Law Clerk under the supervision of*

the Principal District/District and Sessions Judges or Members of the Higher Judicial Services, and the remaining six months under the supervision of a sitting Judge of the concerned High Court;

(v) The aforesaid one-year period of Law Clerkship shall also be treated as equivalent to one year of practice at the Bar for the purposes of satisfying the three-year requirement;

(vi) During the period of Law Clerkship, the Trainee Judicial Officer shall be paid same emoluments as admissible during their training in State Judicial Academies, with no further allowance, etc.; and

(vii) Upon completion of the Law Clerkship, the sitting Judge of the High Court under whose supervision the Trainee Judicial Officer has served shall submit a reasoned evaluation report concerning the performance and suitability of the trainee. Upon such evaluation being found satisfactory, the Trainee Judicial Officer shall be appointed to the regular post in the field and shall thereafter be entitled to the regular pay scale and other service benefits attached to the post."

21. In respect to notification(s)/advertisement(s) for recruitments issued on or after 01.04.2027, in the transition period, following directions were given by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***Bhumika Trust*** (supra):

"74. We further direct that for the period following the transition period, i.e., notification/advertisement(s) issued on or after 01.04.2027, the following directions shall govern the recruitment to the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division):

(i) Every candidate seeking to appear for the examination for appointment as Civil Judge (Junior Division) shall possess at least one year of actual practice from the source and certification as laid down in direction (vii) and (viii) of the Judgment under Review for now and thereafter

as laid down hereinafter. Such practice shall be subject to verification through issuance of a Certificate of Practice, which shall not be issued unless the candidate's presence and participation in effective judicial proceedings, whether along with a senior member of the Bar with at least 10 years practice or otherwise, have been duly recorded in accordance with the mechanism to be prescribed by the High Courts;

(ii) The application of a candidate for recruitment to the judicial service from the aforesaid recruitment cycle shall be entertained only upon submission of the requisite certificate evidencing completion of one year of actual practice in the District Courts; and

(iii) Candidates selected pursuant to such recruitment shall, notwithstanding their one year of prior practice, undergo the same one-year period of intensive training at the State Judicial Academy followed by 6 months of Law Clerkship under the Principal District/District and Sessions Judges or Members of the Higher Judicial Services and thereafter another 6 months of Law Clerkship under a sitting Judge of the concerned High Court, in terms of directions (ii) to (vii) of Paragraph 73."

22. It was specifically held that period of three years would provide sufficient institutional experience to evaluate whether the combination of limited prior practice, structured training and supervised clerkship is achieving desired objective and that the Court may thereafter revisit the scheme as formulated on the basis of material concerning the quality of recruitment, performance of trainees, adequacy of training and other relevant indicators and that the scheme so formulated was not immutable and shall remain in force for a period of five years from the date of said judgment i.e., 21.08.2026.

23. It is, thus, apparent that Hon'ble the Supreme Court categorically held that as more than one year has elapsed since pronouncement of judgment under review, i.e. 20.05.2025, the law graduates could safely be presumed to have either engaged in practice at Bar, or served as law clerks to Hon'ble Judges, or gained experience in law firms. It was categorically held that it is only, as a one-time measure, that such experience may be treated to be on par with one year of practice at Bar, and such period would be deemed to be one year of active practice without requirement of law graduates having to furnish a separate Certificate of Practice in respect of said deemed period.

24. By no stretch of imagination, can it be held that period of one year of active practice itself has been waived by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in case of notification/ advertisement issued after passing judgment under review, i.e. from 20.05.2025, up to 31.3.2027. The only succor provided as a onetime measure is that law graduates who have completed this one year shall not be required to provide a separate Certificate of Practice in respect to said deemed period.

25. Wholesome construct of decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Bhumika Trust*** (supra) and the entire gamut of facts succinctly point out that Hon'ble the Supreme Court has upheld the requirement of three years of practice for notification/ advertisement issued after judgment under review, i.e. from 20.05.2025 till 31.03.2027. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, by way of its judgment in the case of ***Bhumika Trust*** (supra), has provided a

structured and workable mechanism through which the requirement of three years of practice is implemented to ensure that judicial service continues to attract meritorious persons. It has been concluded that all law graduates applying for post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) shall necessarily possess at least one year of actual practice from source and certification as laid down in directions vide clauses (vii) & (viii) of para 89 of judgment, dated 20.05.2025. It shall be incumbent upon law graduates to submit a Certificate of Practice, which shall not be issued unless the candidate's presence and participation in effective judicial proceedings, either along with a Senior Member of Bar with at least 10 years' practice or otherwise, have been duly recorded in accordance with the mechanism which may be prescribed by concerned High Courts.

26. With due humility and respect, in our considered opinion, no exemption has been provided by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in respect to completion of one year of practice prior to applying for post of Civil Judge (Junior Division). It is only, in respect to notification(s)/ advertisement(s) for recruitment issued after judgment under review (20.05.2025) up to 31.03.2027, that the concession provided to candidates is that they shall not be required to furnish a separate Certificate of Practice in support of said one year period of active practice and they shall be deemed to have completed said one year without submission of such certificate. Argument raised on behalf of petitioners is that the candidate is deemed to have completed one year of practice even though a period of one year has admittedly not yet

passed since graduation of the said candidate/obtaining of provisional enrollment/registration with the concerned State Bar Council. It is reiterated that this argument is devoid of any merit, as, in our considered opinion, concession afforded by Hon'ble the Supreme Court to candidates applying for recruitment in pursuance to notification(s)/ advertisement(s) for post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) in the transitional period, i.e., from 20.05.2025 to 31.03.2027, is, that they are not required to furnish a separate Certificate of Practice. As per majority view in judgment, dated 21.08.2026, it is specifically observed that, in view of more than one year having elapsed since judgment under review was pronounced i.e., on 20.05.2025, law graduates, for the purposes of their applications, shall be deemed "to have completed one year of practice".

27. This is further cemented by Hon'ble the Supreme Court, in its subsequent decision in ***Tapasmita Sutar Vs. Union of India & others***[6], wherein it is held as under:

> *"13. The requirement of minimum one year of practice is, therefore, an essential and independent component of the scheme. It is the only component that precedes the examination, and the only one through which a candidate experiences the working of courts from the side of the Bar. The treatment of other forms of experience, including Law Clerkship, at par with practice at the Bar was accepted only as a one-time measure for the transitional period, as specified in paragraph 66 of the Judgment dated 21.08.2026, and finds expression in the deemed year of practice extended to all law graduates by paragraph 73(i). For recruitment notified on or after 01.04.2027, paragraph 74 insists upon a certificate evidencing one year of*

[6] W.P.(C) No.1224 of 2026, dated 06.10.2026

"actual practice in the District Courts", and requires selected candidates to undergo training and Law Clerkship "notwithstanding their one year of prior practice."

28. Keeping in view facts and circumstances as above, we do not find any merit in arguments raised on behalf of petitioners that period of one year practice has itself been done away with by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in case of notifications/ advertisements issued after judgment under review, i.e. from 20.05.2025 to 31.03.2027.

29. In the given factual matrix, Clause II (A) (a) in notification, dated 25.09.2026, issued by High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amaravati, does not suffer from any infirmity, irregularity or illegality. In our considered opinion, same is in consonance with judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***Bhumika Trust*** (supra). No other argument was raised.

30. Writ petitions are accordingly dismissed. No costs.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

LISA GILL, CJ

CHALLA GUNARANJAN, J

kbs

Whether the order is Speaking/Reasoned : Yes / No

Whether the order is Reportable : Yes / No

71

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE LISA GILL, CHIEF JUSTICE
&
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHALLA GUNARANJAN

W.P.Nos.30492, 30153, 30157,
30163 & 30514 of 2026

Dt: 16.10.2026

kbs