

* THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

+ WRIT PETITION NO.3349/2025

% Dated: 22.01.2026

Salikameni Pedda Madhu YadavPetitioner

And

The High Court of Andhra Pradesh
Rep. by Registrar Recruitment and another
.....Respondents

! Counsel for the Appellants : Sri P.Ravikanth

^ Counsel for the Respondents : Sri L.Sai Manoj Reddy

< GIST :

> HEAD NOTE :

? Cases referred :

1. 2023 SCC OnLine 1212
2. 2022(14)SCC 35

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO.3349 OF 2025

Salikameni Pedda Madhu YadavPetitioner

And

The High Court of Andhra Pradesh
Rep. by Registrar Recruitment and another
.....Respondents

DATE OF ORDER PRONOUNCED: 22.01.2026

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers Yes/No
may be allowed to see the Judgments?

2. Whether the copies of judgment may be Yes/No
Marked to Law Reporters/Journals.

3. Whether Their Lordship wishes Yes/No
to see the fair copy of the Judgment?

RAVI NATH TILHARI, J

MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM, J

APHC010060752025



IN THE
HIGH
COURT OF
ANDHRA
PRADESH
AT
AMARAVATI
(Special
Original
Jurisdiction)
[3524]

THURSDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF JANUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO
KUNCHEAM**

WRIT PETITION NO: 3349/2025

Between:

1. SALIKAMENI PEDDA MADHU YADAV,, S/O.SALIKAMENI
MADDAIAH YADAV, AGED ABOUT 22 YEARS, TELUGU
PETA, KONDAPETA, BANAGANAPALLI, KURNOOL
DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH, PIN CODE 518124.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP.BY
REGISTRAR RECRUITMENT, NELAPADU,

AMARAVATHI,GUNTUR DISTRICT. ANDHRA PRADESH.

2.THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE, KURNOOL, KURNOOL DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.VEERAMANI KUKKALA

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.N V SUMANTH

The Court made the following:

ORDER: (*per Hon'ble Sri Justice Ravi Nath Tilhari*)

Heard Sri P.Ravi Kanth, learned counsel representing Sri K.Veeramani, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri L.Sai Manoj Reddy, learned counsel for Sri N.V.Sumanth, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents 1 and 2.

2. The petitioner was provisionally selected in the post of 'office subordinate' in the District Judiciary, Kurnool District pursuant to the Notification No.10/2022-RC, dated 21.10.2022. He could not be selected as he failed to submit the original of transfer study certificate(in short 'the document') by the date fixed i.e. 06.09.2023.

3. Challenging the non-selection on the aforesaid ground, the present petition has been filed for direction to the 2nd respondent in

particular to select the petitioner on par with the other selected candidates in BC 'D' category.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the self-attested copy of the document was produced on 06.09.2023. He submits that there is no dispute that the original document was not submitted. The further stand taken in the writ petition is that the original was tried to be submitted on 08.09.2023 but the same was not accepted.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the condition No.V in Para No.10 was not mandatory. He placed reliance in the case of ***Sweety Kumari v. The State of Bihar and others***¹, to contend that when production of the original certificate was not mandatory, non-production of original at the time of interview would not be sufficient to reject the candidature of a candidate, who was placed in the merit.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that as per the Notification Condition No.(V), para No.10, the applicant had to produce the original certificates on the day mentioned by the High

¹ 2023 SCC OnLine 1212

Court for verification. If the applicant failed to produce any of the required certificates, his/her candidature will be rejected.

7. The contention that the petitioner failed to submit the document on 08.09.2023 has been specifically denied in the counter-affidavit.

8. Learned counsel for the respondents further submits that selection is of the year 2023. The selected candidates have already joined and they have been given the posting in September, 2023 itself. This petition has been filed after the long delay/laches.

9. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has explained the laches in Para No.6 of the writ petition.

10. We have considered the aforesaid submissions and perused the material on record.

11. There is no dispute that the certificate/document was not produced in original for verification on the date fixed i.e. 06.09.2023.

12. Condition No.(V) in Para No.10 of the Notification reads as under:

"The applicant has to produce original certificates on the day mentioned by the High Court for verification. If the applicant

fails to produce any of the required certificates, his/her candidature will be rejected.”

13. The aforesaid condition appears to us to be mandatory. It in clear terms fixed the date for production of the document in original for verification. It further provides the consequence for the non-production of the original document on the date fixed for verification. The consequence provided is that the candidature shall be rejected. This consequence of the candidature being rejected, lends support to the view that the provision is mandatory. In case of non-compliance the consequences shall follow necessarily.

14. The contention of the petitioner's counsel that such condition is directory and not mandatory cannot be accepted.

15. In ***Sweety Kumari*** (supra), one of the points for consideration was at para 7(i) that whether the rejection of the candidatures of the appellants therein due to non-production of the original certificate at the time of interview by the Bihar Public Service commission (hereinafter referred to as “**BPSC**”) was justified? The Hon’ble Apex Court held that in ***Aarav Jain v. The Bihar Public Service***

Commission and Others², it was held that once such a condition of production of the original certificate was not mandatory, then non-production of original at the time of interview would not be sufficient to reject the candidature.

16. There is no dispute on the proposition of law as laid down in the aforesaid case, which is binding, if production of the original is not a mandatory condition. But, the said principle would not apply in the present case as here, the Condition No.(V) in para No.10, is mandatory and not directory.

17. We have also perused Para No.6 of the writ petition but we are not satisfied with the reasons assigned by the petitioner for filing the petition belatedly. Once the petitioner's case is that on 08.09.2023, the petitioner approached with the original document and the same was not accepted, he would have approached the Court immediately for redressal of his grievances. After the selection is completed and the selected candidates have joined in the year 2023 itself, filing of writ petition in 2025 belatedly without any sufficient explanation cannot be sustained.

² 2022(14)SCC 35

18. Thus considered, we do not find, any illegality in the rejection of the petitioner's candidature.

19. The Writ Petition is devoid of merits and is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

As a sequel, interlocutory applications pending if any, shall stand closed.

RAVI NATH TILHARI, J

MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM, J

Date: 22.01.2026

Note:

L.R. copy to be marked.

B/o.

Pab

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SRI JUSTICE MAHESWARA RAO KUNCHEAM

WRIT PETITION NO: 3349/2025

DATE: 22.01.2026

Pab