

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH :: AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)



TUESDAY, THE SIXTEENTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FOUR

PRESENT
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION NO: 34079 OF 2022

Between:

Basava Srinivas,

...Petitioner

AND

1. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principle Secretary, Department of Revenue (Commercial Taxes), AP Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravati.
2. Commissioner of State Tax (AP), , Department of Commercial Taxes Office at Door No.5-59, R. K. Spring Valley Apartments, Bandar Road, Eedupugallu Village, Kankipadu Mandal.
3. The Joint Commissioner, Department of Commercial Taxes, Eluru Division, Eluru, West Godavari District.
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Department of Commercial Taxes, Eluru Division, Eluru, West Godavari District.

...Respondents

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the not considering the 'Compassionate Appointment' and issuing the impugned Endorsements vide Memo No. REV01-CCSTOCCTC/6/2022-CT-1, dated 05.07.2022 which was ratified and served by 3rd respondent Order dated 16.08.2022, consequently to pass an order to quash the impugned proceeding issued by the 1st respondent under Memo No. REVOI-CCSTOCCTC/6/2022-CT-1, dated 05.07.2022

which was forwarded and served by the 3rd respondent dated 16.08.2022 including the impugned endorsement vide Ref.No.B2/329/2018 dated 14.12.2018 and 24.09.2018 issued by the Respondent No.3 and No.4 where the respondent did not consider the representations dated 18.07.2018, 29.04.2022.and direct the respondents to provide suitable employment to the petitioner on compassionate grounds by relaxing the age relaxation in view of settled GOs and where the similarly situated persons got the age relaxation benefits.

IA NO: 1 OF 2022

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to pass and order to direct the respondents to provide suitable employment to the petitioner on compassionate grounds by relaxing the age relaxation to the to the petitioner case pending disposal of the main Writ Petitioner.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI DR SASTRY JANDHYALA

Counsel for the Respondents: SRI S.RAJU, GP FOR SERVICES - I

The Court made the following order:

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION No. 34079 OF 2022

ORDER:

Heard Sri Dr. Sastry Jandhyala, Learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner and Sri S. Raju, Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Services-I.

2. The prayer sought in the present Writ Petition is as under:

" For the reasons stated in the accompanying affidavit, it is prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ, Order or direction, one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the inaction of the Respondents in not considering the 'Compassionate Appointment' and issuing the impugned Endorsements vide Memo No. REV01-CCSTOCCTC/6/2022-CT-1, dated 05.07.2022 which was ratified and served by 3rd respondent Order dated 16.08.2022, consequently to pass an order to quash the impugned proceeding issued by the 1st respondent under Memo No. REV01-CCSTOCCTC/6/2022-CT-1, dated 05.07.2022 which was forwarded and served by the 3rd respondent dated 16.08.2022 including the impugned endorsement vide Ref.No.B2/329/2018 dated 14.12.2018 and 24.09.2018 issued by the Respondent Nos.3 and No.4 where the respondent did not consider the representations dated 18.07.2018 & 29.04.2022 and direct the respondents to provide suitable employment to the petitioner on compassionate grounds by relaxing the age relaxation in view of settled GOs and where the similarly situated persons got the age relaxation benefits and to pass such other order or orders as the Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case."

Facts in brief as submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the Writ

Petitioner:

3. One Smt. B. Saraswati Devi, while working as Assistant Commercial Tax Officer, Tanuku Circle-1, had died in harness on 06.02.2018; that the deceased employee is survived by the husband, who had been receiving pension, after having superannuated from a private bank (M/s. Karur Vysya Bank); that the retired husband receives Rs.15,000/- per month as pension from M/s. Karur Vysya Bank; the deceased employee is also survived by two sons and one daughter; that the family members have given consent/no objection in favour of the Writ Petitioner, who is the youngest son, for securing a job under the Compassionate Appointment Scheme (Ex.P.3); that the Income Certificate issued by the Tahsildar bearing Roc.No.465/2018/B, dated 12.07.2018 (Ex.P.5) would also indicate that there are no other sources of income to the family; that on the strength of the consent letters/no objection certificate given by the family members and the Income Certificate issued by the Tahsildar, the Writ Petitioner herein had submitted his Application; that since the Application was not being considered, the Writ Petitioner has approached the Respondent Authorities and made several oral requests; that the Writ Petitioner has also submitted a Written Representation on 18.07.2018 (Ex.P.6); that by Order (titled as

endorsement) dated 24.09.2018 (Ex.P.7-Colly) which was again reconfirmed by Order (titled as endorsement) dated 14.12.2018 (Ex.P.7-Colly), the Respondent Authorities have rejected the Application of the Writ Petitioner, seeking Compassionate Appointment, on two grounds namely: *(i) that the Writ Petitioner is age barred, and, (ii) that he is not entitled for Compassionate Appointment as per the conditions laid down in Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012*; that according to the Respondents, this Circular Memo dated 24.03.2012 would stipulate that, if anyone of the parent is a 'service pensioner' and is receiving pension, such pension shall be treated as family earning and that such pensioner is treated as an 'earning member'; and that such Rejection Orders were passed on 24.09.2018 and 14.12.2018 (Ex.P.7-Colly) by placing reliance on the Circular Memo dated 24.03.2012 while the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal (for short the 'Tribunal') had in fact set aside the said Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012 way back on 20.02.2018 in O.A.No.3012/2015 (Ex.P.10);

Filing of W.P.No.20266 of 2021 (1st Round of Litigation)

4. It is further submitted by the Ld. Counsel for the Writ Petitioner that having been aggrieved by the Order passed by the Respondents dated 24.09.2018 and 14.12.2018, the Writ Petitioner filed W.P.No.20266 of 2021 challenging the Orders (titled as Endorsements) bearing Ref.B2/329/2018, dated 24.09.2018 and 14.12.2018 (Ex.P.7-Colly) before this Hon'ble Court; that by Order dated 11.04.2022, a Learned Single Judge of this Court had held both the issues in favour of the Writ Petitioner. Direction was given to the Writ Petitioner to submit a Representation along with all relevant documents. The Respondents were also directed by this Court to consider the Representation of the Writ Petitioner within a period of four weeks from the said date of the Order with a further direction to complete the entire exercise within three months. Operative portion of the Order passed by the Learned Single Judge in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 dated 11.04.2022 is usefully extracted hereunder:

"24. In view of the aforesaid, the impugned order in the present case, cannot be sustained, which is hereby quashed. A direction is issued to the respondent No.4/Deputy Commissioner, Department of Commercial Taxes, West Godavari District, to reconsider the petitioner's case for appointment on compassionate ground in accordance with law and to forward the requisite proposal to consider grant of

relaxation in age rule to the 1st respondent/Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue (Commercial Taxes), Amaravati/Competent Authority. The respondent No.1 is also directed to consider the grant of relaxation of age rule by a reasoned and speaking order.

25. The petitioner is granted liberty to file fresh representation annexing all such documents including copy of the various Government Orders relied upon, along with copy of this order, before the respondent No.2 within a period of four (04) weeks from today.

26. Let the entire exercise be completed by the respondents within a period of three (03) months from the date of presentation of fresh representation as aforesaid.

27. This petition is partly allowed, with the aforesaid observations and directions.”

Contempt Case against inaction of Respondents (2nd

Round of Litigation:

5. It is further submitted by the Learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner that the Writ Petitioner was constrained to file a Contempt Case bearing C.C.No.3311 of 2022 for inaction on the part of the Respondents in completing “the entire exercise” within a period of 3 months. During the pendency of the Contempt Proceeding, the Respondent No.1 herein had passed an order rejecting the plea of the Writ Petitioner for being considered on compassionate grounds vide proceedings dated 05.07.2022. In view of this subsequent development, the Learned Single Judge had dismissed the Contempt Case by recording that the Order of

the Court dated 11.04.2022 was complied with by the Respondents and that the legality of such an Order dated 05.07.2022 cannot be considered in a Contempt Jurisdiction, by “leaving it open to the Petitioner to seek his remedy against the Order dated 05.07.2022 (wrongly typed as 11.04.2022) in appropriate proceeding”.

Present Writ Petition (3rd Round of Litigation)

6. As a sequel to the closure of the Contempt Case bearing C.C.No.3311 of 2022, the present Writ Petition is filed by the Writ Petitioner, assailing the Rejection Order of the Respondent No.1 dated 05.07.2022.

7. Sri Dr. Sastry Jandhyala, Learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner would assail the Impugned Order dated 05.07.2022 by contending that the Respondents have been raising the very same two objections insofar as the entitlement of the Writ Petitioner for Compassionate Appointment is concerned. The first reason for rejection is that the Writ Petitioner is age barred and the second reason for rejection is that the father of the Writ Petitioner is receiving ‘service pension’ of Rs.15,000/- per month, and therefore, the Writ Petitioner cannot be offered Compassionate Appointment.

8. Learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner would submit that these two issues which are shown as reasons for rejection by the Respondents are no more a '*res integra*' inasmuch as the learned Single Judge of this Hon'ble Court had categorically given findings on both the issues in favour of the Writ Petitioner vide Order dated 11.04.2022 in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 (Ex.P.12). He would also contend that the Impugned Order is grossly perverse on the ground that the Respondents cannot resort to the same grounds for rejection since the findings given by the Learned Single Judge dated 11.04.2022 have attained finality against the Respondents.

9. Learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner would submit that even the earlier round of litigation (in W.P.No.20266 of 2021) was quite avoidable, had the Authorities acted fairly, objectively and by proper application of mind without placing reliance on the 'dead-letter' of the Circular Memo dated 24.03.2012 because, this Circular Memo dated 24.03.2012 stood quashed by the Hon'ble Tribunal (A.P Administrative Tribunal) way back on 20.02.2018 (Ex.P.10). Learned Counsel would also contend that the present Impugned Order is not only grossly perverse but also grossly

contemptuous inasmuch as the Officer who had passed the Impugned Order has neither regard for the Rule of Law nor for the Principles of Constitutional Law, more particularly, with regard to the contours and limitations prescribed for the Executive. He would submit that the conduct of the Officer who had passed the Impugned Order is a blatant affront on the 'Rule of Law' and the 'Constitutional Governance', inasmuch as the Executive cannot 'sit in appeal' against the Judicial Verdict and pass such order which is against the ratio of such Judicial Verdict.

Submissions of Ld. Asst. Government Pleader for

Services-I:

10. Sri S. Raju, Learned Assistant Government Pleader for Services-I appearing for the Respondents would sustain the Impugned Order. He would reiterate the grounds on which the request of the Writ Petitioner was rejected; namely, on the ground of being age barred and also on the ground that the father of the Writ Petitioner is receiving 'service pension'. Learned Counsel for the Respondents has also placed reliance on the averments made in the Counter Affidavit dated 07.11.2022 (filed on 11.11.2022), which is affirmed by one Sri Kolavennu Nagendra Kumar, Joint Commissioner (State Tax), Vijayawada.

11. After having noted the facts in the present case, this Court is unable to contain its anguish as regards the manner in which the Executive (the Prl. Secretary-Respondent No.1) have acted, which is not only irrational, unjust and arbitrary, but by exhibiting 'executive arrogance' not only towards the cause of the Writ petitioner but also towards the constitutional duties, which are ordained and mandated to the 'Executive'. While the facts in this case appeared to be so 'benign', the conduct of the Executive in this case would raise several constitutional and seminal legal issues, touching upon the Rule of Law, the Separation of Powers and the 'constitutional imperative' on the part of the Executive in implementing and or in giving effect to the Orders of the Court, both, in letter and spirit.

12. This Court has noticed that the controversy would revolve around the Impugned Order passed by one Sri N. Gulzar, Prl. Secretary to Government (CT) Finance vide Memo No. REV01-CCSTOCCTC/6/2022-CT-I dated 05.07.2022 (Ex.P.8). Therefore, this Court would consider all the legal issues arising out of this Impugned Order dated 05.07.2022 (Ex.P.8) only. Therefore, this Court would deem it extremely important to extract the Impugned Order in its entirety as hereunder:-

" GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
REVENUE (CT-I) DEPARTMENT

MEMO NO. REVO1-CCSTOCCTC/6/2022-CT-I Dated:05.07.2022

Sub: Public Services - Commercial Taxes Department - Sri Basava Srinivas, Tanuku, West Godavari District - Compassionate Appointment - W.P.No.20266/2021 filed - Hon'ble APHC orders - Request rejected - Reg.

- Ref: 1. **Hon'ble APHC orders dated 11.04.2022 in W.P.No.20266/2021 filed by Sri Basava Srinivas, Tanuku, W.G.Dist. (emphasis supplied)**
2. Representation of Sri Basava Srinivas, Tanuku, W.G.Dist., dated 29.04.2022 addressed to the CCST, A.P., Vijayawada.
3. Govt. Memo No.REV01-CCSTOCCTC/6/2022-CT-I, Dated 09.05.2022.
4. From the CCST, A.P., Vijayawada letter in CCT's Ref.No.C1/80/2021, dated 19.05.2022.

The attention of the Chief Commissioner of State Tax, Andhra Pradesh, Vijayawada is invited to the references cited.

2. In the reference 1st cited, the Hon'ble Andhra Pradesh High Court in its orders dated 11.04.2022 in W.P.No.20266/2021 filed by Sri Basava Srinivas, Tanuku, West Godvari District held that:

"In view of the aforesaid, the impugned order in the present case, cannot be sustained, which is hereby quashed. A direction is issued to the respondent No.4 Deputy Commissioner, Department of Commercial Taxes, West Godavari District, to reconsider the petitioner's case for appointment on compassionate ground in accordance with law and to forward the requisite proposal to consider grant of relaxation in age rule to the 1st respondent/Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue (Commercial Taxes), Amaravathi/Competent Authority. The respondent No.1 is also directed to consider the grant of relaxation of age rule by a reasoned and speaking order.

The petitioner is granted liberty to file fresh representation annexing all such documents including copy of the various Government Orders relied upon, along with copy of this order, before the respondent No.2 with a period of four (04) weeks from today.

Let the entire exercise be completed by the respondents within a period of three (03) months from the date of presentation of fresh representation as aforesaid. "

3. In the reference 2nd cited, Sri Basava Srinivas, Tanuku, West Godvari District requested the Chief Commissioner of State Tax, Andhra Pradesh, Vijayawada to help him relaxing his age and provide compassionate appointment.

4. In the reference 4th cited, the Chief Commissioner of State Tax, Andhra Pradesh, Vijayawada requested the Government to issue appropriate orders/instructions in the matter.

5. Government examined the issue with reference to the orders issued vide Govt Memo.No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dt:24.03.2012, pension can be treated as earning and pensioner can be treated as the earning member and also that the dependent children of the Government employee, who died while in service cannot be considered for appointment under the scheme of compassionate appointment, when the other parent, who had retired from service and is in receipt of service pension. It is further informed that as per para 2 VIII (iv) of the consolidated instructions issued vide Circular Memo No.60681/Ser.A/2003-1 dt.12.8.2003, the Rule of reservation as per Rule 22 of Andhra Pradesh State and Subordinate Service Rules shall be followed in compassionate appointments and as per para 2(VI) (a) of the said instructions, the maximum age limit shall be 33 years for Open Category, and for Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe/Backward Classes 5 (Five) years age concession shall be given. **As per Rule 12(1)(a)(v) of A.P. State & Subordinate Service Rules, 1996, as amended in G.O.Ms.No.759, G.A.(Ser.D) Dept., dt: 6-10-2007, no person shall be eligible for direct recruitment if he is less than 18 years of age and unless otherwise specified in the special or adhoc rules and if he is more than 34 years of age as on the 1st day of July of the year in which the notification for selection to the relevant post, category or class or a service is made.**

6. In the present Sri Basava Srinivas has crossed the age limit prescribed and his father is a retired bank employee and drawing service pension.

7. Therefore, the request of Sri Basava Srinivas is not in accordance with the rule position stated above and accordingly, his request for compassionate appointment is not feasible to consider and accordingly rejected.

8. The Chief Commissioner of State Tax is requested to take further action accordingly.

N GULZAR
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (CT) FINANCE

To:

The Chief Commissioner of State Tax, Andhra Pradesh, Vijayawada.
The individual through the Chief Commissioner of State Tax, Andhra Pradesh, Vijayawada.

Copy to:
The Joint Commissioner (ST), Eluru Division, Eluru.
The Deputy Commissioner (ST), Eluru Division, Eluru.

//FORWARDED :: BY ORDER //

Sd/--
SECTION OFFICER

Office of the
Joint Commissioner (ST),
Eluru.

Ref.No.B2/329/2018

Dt:16-08-2022

//FORWARDED//

Sd/--
JOINT COMMISSIONER
ELURU

To
Sri Basava Srinivas,
S/o (Late) B. Saraswathi Devi, GSTO,
O/o Commercial Tax Officer.I, Tanuku"

(emphasis supplied)

DISCUSSION:

13. As regards the Writ Petitioner being over aged is concerned, it was held in the Endorsement dated 24.09.2018 and reiterated in the Endorsement dated 14.12.2018 (Ex.P.7) that the Writ Petitioner is over aged inasmuch as for the Open Category, the age limit for consideration for Compassionate Appointment is 33 years whereas the Writ Petitioner had exceeded that age. The Writ Petitioner has placed on record several Government Orders which have relaxed the age for several similarly situated persons. This aspect was also considered by the Learned Single Judge in

W.P.No.20266 of 2021 and held that the case of the Writ Petitioner shall be considered by grant of relaxation of age after considering the fact that the upper age has been relaxed vide G.O.Ms.No.62 dated 30.05.2016 (Ex.P.17).

14. The fact is that the Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012 expressly stood set aside by the Hon'ble Tribunal vide Order dated 20.02.2018 (Ex.P.10). The relevant portion of the Order of the Hon'ble Tribunal is usefully extracted hereunder:

"8. A perusal of the above observations of the Apex Court would clearly show that the object of providing compassionate appointment and the purpose sought to be achieved through the same is only to provide livelihood, but it is not a kind of recruitment. It was never the case of the respondents that family members of an employee died in harness, will be provided with compassionate appointment and that they will not be provided with any family pension. Further, as per the scheme cited by the respondents in G.O.Ms.No.687, dated 03.10.1977, the first and foremost condition for providing compassionate appointment is that there will be no other earning member in the family. In the case on hand, the applicant's father is a pensioner and also receiving family pension. With regard to this aspect, this court has already held that a pensioner cannot be treated as earning member, because, the pension is a component paid by the employer for the services rendered by the employee in order to sustenance after retirement and therefore, a pensioner cannot be treated as an earning member of the family. Therefore, the contention of the respondents that the applicant's father is a pensioner and thereby, the applicant is not entitled for compassionate appointment cannot be accepted. Nowhere in the scheme of compassionate appointment, there is a condition that the compassionate appointment will be provided to those family members, who are not in receipt of family pension. Therefore, the ground taken by the respondents in denying the applicant compassionate appointment on the ground that his father is a

pensioner and receiving family pension is totally untenable and defeats the very object of providing compassionate appointment. Therefore, the Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012 to the effect that pension is an earning and pensioner is to be treated as an earning member, to deny very consideration of himself or his family members for appointment under the scheme of compassionate grounds, is liable to be declared as illegal and arbitrary.

Hence, the Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012 issued by the 3rd respondent and the order in Rc.No.A4/162/2013, dated 11.07.2013 issued by the 1st respondent, rejecting the case of the applicant in O.A.No.3012/2015 are set aside."

(emphasis supplied)

15. This Order of the Hon'ble Tribunal dated 20.02.2018 (Ex.P.10) had attained finality. Despite this, the Endorsements issued by the Official Respondents dated 24.09.2018 and 14.12.2018 bearing Ref.No.B2/329/2018 (Ex.P.7-colly), would indicate that the Respondent Authorities had still followed/relied on the Circular Memo which stood expressly set aside on 20.02.2018. When the Endorsements were challenged before this Court vide W.P.No.20266 of 2021, the Learned Single Judge of the Hon'ble Court had considered the legal effect of the Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012 and held that the said Memo cannot be pressed into service by the Respondents for denying the rightful entitlement of the Writ Petitioner. The Learned Single Judge, by Order dated 11.04.2022 (Ex.P.11) had held as under:

“21. With respect to the second ground of rejection, in Para Nos.8 and 9 of the petition, it has been stated that the G.O. dated 24.03.2012 has been set aside, to which there is no specific denial in the counter affidavit.”

(emphasis supplied)

ISSUES:

16. In the above premise, the following issues would fall for consideration:

- i. Whether the Respondent No.1 is bound to relax the age of the Writ Petitioner in terms of Paragraph Nos.19 to 21 of the Order dated 11.04.2022 in W.P.No.20266 of 2021?
- ii. Whether the factual issue with regard to the applicability of Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012 has attained finality against the State or whether it is open to the Executive to place reliance on the Circular Memo to deny the claim of the Writ Petitioner for a job under the Compassionate Appointment Scheme ?
- iii. Whether the Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012 is a dead letter, which cannot be relied on, in view of the said Circular Memo being set aside by the Order dated 20.02.2018 in O.A.No.3012 of 2015 (Ex.P.10) ?
- iv. Whether the Order passed by the Learned Single Judge dated 11.04.2022 in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 binds the Executive or whether the Executive can 'sit in appeal' against the Order of the Learned Single Judge dated 11.04.2022 in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 ?
- v. If the Principal Secretary has sat in Appeal against the Judicial Order (in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 dated

11.04.2022), what is the nature of the action that can be taken against such Officer ?

Issue No.1: Age Relaxation:

17. Learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 dated 11.04.2022 (Ex.P.11) had dealt with this issue thread bear and had categorically held that the Writ Petitioner is entitled for age relaxation for the reasons stated therein. This finding which is rendered by the Learned Single Judge has attained finality, inasmuch as the Official Respondents have not preferred any Appeal against the Order passed by the Learned Single Judge dated 11.04.2022 in W.P.No.20266 of 2021.

18. In order to dispel any doubt that the Order passed by the Learned Single Judge in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 dated 11.04.2022 in respect of age relaxation which the Writ Petitioner is entitled has attained finality, the findings rendered by the Learned Single Judge in the said Writ Petition are usefully extracted hereunder:-

“19. In view of the Government Orders, upon which reliance has been placed by the learned counsel for the petitioner, annexed to the additional documents, ***the Court finds that the Government decided to enhance the upper age limit for direct recruitment to 42 years from 35 years to the various categories of posts notified by all the recruiting agencies in the State of Andhra Pradesh for certain period***

which was extended from time to time. If such relaxation can be granted for the upper age against the direct recruitment post, for compassionate appointment also against direct recruitment post, age relaxation in the upper age can be considered, particularly when Paragraph No.4 Clause (d) provides for the same and in one case vide G.O.Ms.No.62 dated 30.05.2016, such relaxation in upper age with respect to the compassionate appointment was granted in favour of some other candidate.

20. I find substance in the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that instead of rejecting the petitioner's claim for compassionate appointment on the ground of age, the proposal should have been forwarded to the concerned department in Government to consider for relaxation in age rule."

24. In view of the aforesaid, the impugned order in the present case, cannot be sustained, which is hereby quashed. A direction is issued to the respondent No.4/Deputy, Commissioner, Department of Commercial Taxes, West Godavari District., to reconsider the petitioner's case for appointment on compassionate ground in accordance with law and to forward the requisite proposal to consider grant of relaxation in age rule to the 1st respondent/ Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue (Commercial Taxes), Amaravathi/Competent Authority. The respondent No. 1 is also directed to consider the grant of relaxation of age rule by a reasoned and speaking order."

(emphasis supplied)

Issue Nos.2 & 3: 'Service Pension' received by the father of Writ Petitioner:

19. Factually, the mother of the Writ Petitioner died in harness while working as Assistant Commercial Tax Officer. By

the date of her death, the Writ Petitioner's father who was working in a private bank (M/s. Karur Vysya Bank) has already retired and was drawing a meagre 'service pension' of Rs.15,000/- per month. It is stated in the Affidavit that this Rs.15,000/- drawn by the father of the Writ Petitioner as service pension was barely enough to meet with his medical expenses, and therefore, no monetary benefit is flowing to the rest of the family from out of the 'service pension' received by the father of the Writ Petitioner. This apart, this condition imposed by the Official Respondents vide Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012 has been expressly set aside by the Hon'ble Tribunal vide Order dated 20.02.2018 in O.A.No.3012 of 2015 (Ex.P.10). This Order of Tribunal has become final against the Respondents, and therefore, the restrictions emerging from the Circular Memo dated 24.03.2012 does not 'survive' any more. This aspect of the matter was also dealt with by the Learned Single Judge in no uncertain terms (vide Order dated 11.04.2022 in W.P.No.20266 of 2022 (Ex.P.11). The operative portion of the Order is usefully extracted hereunder:-

"22. In W.P.No.16242 of 2013 the Division Bench of this Court held as under :

"Yet another defence is taken by the learned counsel that as the wife of the deceased is getting

family pension, the applicant is not entitled for compassionate appointment. But the same cannot be accepted. Merely because family pension is being paid to the wife of the deceased, the same is not a ground to deprive the benefit of compassionate appointment under this scheme notified by the Government for the children of the deceased who dies in harness.

For the aforesaid reasons, we do not find any valid ground to interfere with the order of the Tribunal.

The Writ Petition is accordingly dismissed. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner seeks time to comply the directions issued by the Tribunal and to issue appointment order to the applicant. In view of the request, two months time is extended from today to comply the directions by issuing an appointment order to the applicant.

Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Writ Petition, shall stand closed. No costs.

23. Following the said judgment, a coordinate bench of this Court in W.P.No.27465 of 2017, in which the G.O, dated 24.03.2012 was involved, held as under:-

"It is to be seen that the Division Bench while dealing with the similar issue arising out of order passed by the Andhra Pradesh Administrative Tribunal, held as follows:

"Yet another defence is taken by the learned counsel that as the wife of the deceased is getting family pension, the applicant is not entitled for compassionate appointment. But the same cannot be accepted. Merely because family pension is being paid to the wife of the deceased, the same is not a ground to deprive the benefit of compassionate appointment under this scheme notified by the Government for the children of the deceased who dies in harness."

In view of the above, the impugned order is set aside and the respondent authorities are directed to reconsider the application of the petitioner and take action accordingly.

The writ petition is allowed to the extent indicated

above. No order as to costs. As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the writ petition, shall stand closed."

24. In view of the aforesaid, the impugned order in the present case, cannot be sustained, which is hereby quashed. A direction is issued to the respondent No.4/Deputy, Commissioner, Department of Commercial Taxes, West Godavari District., to reconsider the petitioner's case for appointment on compassionate ground in accordance with law and to forward the requisite proposal to consider grant of relaxation in age rule to the 1st respondent/ Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue (Commercial Taxes), Amaravathi/Competent Authority. The respondent No. 1 is also directed to consider the grant of relaxation of age rule by a reasoned and speaking order."

(emphasis supplied)

20. Therefore, from the above narration of facts, it makes it abundantly clear that the two objections which are raised by the Respondents for denying legitimate claim of the Writ Petitioner under Compassionate Appointment Scheme have been categorically decided against the Respondents and in favour of the Writ Petitioner.

21. The present Impugned Order bearing Memo No. REV01-CCSTOCCTC/6/2022-CT-I dated 05.07.2022 (Ex.P.8) has been passed rejecting the request of the Writ Petitioner for Compassionate Appointment.

22. The second objection taken by the Respondents in rejecting the request of the Writ Petitioner is on the ground that the father who is a retired private bank employee is drawing 'service pension of Rs.15,000/- Per Month', and therefore, the Writ Petitioner is not entitled for seeking job under Compassionate Appointment Scheme. For this purpose, the Respondent No.1 has placed reliance on the Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012. As indicated earlier, the said Circular Memo dated 24.03.2012 is only a 'dead letter' inasmuch as the Hon'ble Tribunal was pleased to set aside the said Circular Memo dated 24.03.2012 vide Order dated 20.02.2018 in O.A.No.3012 of 2015 (Ex.P.10).

23. Needless to state that the Respondent No.1 ought not to have declined the relief sought by the Writ Petitioner by referring to the Circular Memo dated 24.03.2012, since the Order of the Hon'ble Tribunal setting aside the said Circular Memo dated 24.03.2012, has attained finality way-back on 20.02.2018.

24. Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012, was admittedly set aside, and therefore, it has attained finality. Therefore, under any circumstances, the Respondent No.1 ought not to have placed reliance to the 'dead

letter' of the Circular Memo dated 24.03.2012 in the Impugned Proceedings. This apart, the Learned Single Judge had also dealt with this very issue by categorically holding that the said Circular Memo cannot be relied on by the Official Respondents in view of the Order passed by the Tribunal setting aside on 20.02.2018.

Issue No.4:

25. Since the present conduct of the Secretary to Government (CT), Finance has raised several 'seminal issues', this Court deems it appropriate to analyse the core issues threadbare. The request of the Writ Petitioner seeking Compassionate Appointment was opposed by the Respondents on two grounds:

- a) That the Writ Petitioner had crossed the age of 34 years, which is the upper limit of the age for O.C community candidates for seeking employment, which *ipso facto* applies even in cases of Compassionate Appointment.
- b) That the Circular Memo No.3548/Ser.G/A2/2010-8, dated 24.03.2012 prohibits persons from seeking compassionate appointment, if the other surviving parent has retired from service and getting 'service pension'.

Executive had over-stepped the 'Principal Doctrinal Barrier' as set forth by the Constitution of India

26. From the analysis of the facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that the Principal Secretary/Respondent No.1 has crossed the '*Laxman Rekha*' which is impermissible. The Respondent No.1 namely the Prl. Secretary to Government (CT) Finance, from the Indian Administrative Service (IAS), ought to have simply read and understood the ratio laid down by the Learned Single Judge in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 dated 11.04.2022 (Ex.P.11) and proceeded in terms of the 'letter and spirit' of the said Order. If the said Secretary to Government (CT) Finance had acted accordingly, there is no choice for him but to implement the ratio laid down by the Learned Single Judge, since the two objections raised by the Respondents have been categorically settled by the Learned Single Judge and had attained finality. The 'Reference No.1' in the Impugned Order in fact is nothing but the Order passed by the Learned Single Judge dated 11.04.2022 in W.P.No.20266 of 2021. This Court is unable to countenance as to the nature of authority or the power that can be exercised by this Prl. Secretary to Government, Finance in

passing the Impugned Order which is directly in conflict with the findings and the ratio rendered by the Learned Single Judge in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 dated 11.04.2022. This illegal, blatant and defiant conduct on the part of the Prl. Secretary to Government (CT) Finance, tantamounts to a clear act of disobedience. There is no manner of doubt that this Principal Secretary has crossed the '*laxman rekha*' which is the inviolable 'prohibited zone' as is contemplated under the 'Principal Doctrinal Barrier'. The cherished principles of 'Checks and Balances' and the 'Constitutional Governance' find their genesis from the doctrinal concepts of 'Rule of Law' and the 'Separation of Powers' which are the basic features of our Constitution (*Keshavananda Bharati's case*).

The Principal Secretary (the Executive) 'sat in appeal'
on the Judicial Verdict that attained finality

27. The Prl. Secretary to Government (CT) Finance has 'sat in Appeal' against the Judicial Order passed by the Learned Single Judge dated 11.04.2022 which raises several seminal issues touching upon the power of the Executive under Article 162 of the Constitution of India and the contours within which the Executive can discharge their executive functions. The delicate

balance which the Constitution of India has set forth for the three organs of the State and which is governed by the 'Principal Doctrinal Barrier' under the concept of 'Separation of Powers' is also shaken-up due to the unconstitutional approach adopted by the Respondent No.1. Separation of Powers is held to be a part one of the basic structure of the Constitution which prescribes 'checks and balances' as regards the distribution of not only the powers but also the functions of the three organs of the State. Article 162 of the Constitution of India limits the executive power only to be in tandem with the legislative power of the State.

28. Neither the Article 162 nor any other provision of the Constitution has empowered the Executive to 'sit in appeal' against the Judicial Order and veto or frustrate a Judicial Order either directly or indirectly. Therefore, this extreme executive behaviour, as in the present case, demands a differential and proportionate response, for it is the judiciary which is the 'sentinel on the *qui vive*' that is given the solemn constitutional duty to preserve the delicate balance between the three organs of the State. The Impugned Order herein does indicate that the concerned Officer has consciously chosen a 'collisive approach', which reflects extreme degree of disobedience on his part, that

cannot be left untreated. Lest, this Court would be failing in its solemn constitutional duty in preserving the pristinity of the judicial process.

Case of 'res ipsa loquitur'

29. This is a case of *res ipsa loquitur*. A strange phenomenon has unfolded in this case inasmuch as the Officer who passed the Impugned Order and the Deponent of the Counter Affidavit (another Officer) have both approached this issue as if the Judicial Verdict handed down by the Court of Record which attained finality, can be treated like dust with an assumption that the Executive is endowed with Constitutional power to 'sit in appeal' against a Judicial Verdict. Before this strange phenomenon partakes the character of a contagious and virulent epidemic, preventive measures shall be called for.

Binding Precedents

30. The Hon'ble Apex Court while dealing with an identical situation, has taken judicial note of the blatant acts of wilful disobedience by the executive in executing or giving effect to the Orders of the Court.

31. The Hon'ble Apex Court in *E.T. Sunup Vs. C.A.N.S.S.*

Employees Association and Another [(2004) 8 SCC 683] held

as under:

“15. We have heard both the learned counsel at length. We are of the opinion that the present order passed by the High Court in the facts and circumstances of the case is fully justified. Once a stand was taken by the Advocate General that the ban does not survive and amount of GPF was disbursed during the period 1996-97, then there was no reason why the order banning disbursement of GPF was not revoked. The stand taken by the State on one hand that amount of GPF was disbursed, still they were not prepared to revoke the order, we fail to understand this inconsistent stand. Once the administrative order is issued then it cannot be revoked by oral submission before court. It has to be revoked by another administrative order (which they have now passed). If the Advocate General had made a statement before the Court then it should have been followed with the administrative order revoking the ban. Till the date of argument learned counsel for the appellant could not produce before us the order revoking the ban, on the contrary the ban was kept in force and the second contempt petition was filed before the Court and the Advocate General again made a statement that GPF applications will be processed; that makes the matter worse for the petitioner and it does not mitigate the situation. ***It is different that realisation has now dawned upon the authorities as they find no escape route for them, therefore, they have now revoked the order dated 25-2-1997 by the order dated 23-9-2004 after close of arguments.***

16. ***It has become a tendency with the government officers to somehow or the other circumvent the orders of court and try to take recourse to one justification or other. This shows complete lack of grace in accepting the orders of the Court. This tendency of undermining the Court's order cannot be countenanced. This Court time and again has emphasised that in a democracy the role of the court cannot be subservient to administrative fiat. The executive and legislature have to work within the constitutional framework and the judiciary has been given the role of watchdog to keep***

the legislature and executive within check. In the present case, we fail to understand the counter filed by the appellant before the Court. On one hand they say that all the cases of GPF have been processed and on the other hand they are not prepared to revoke the administrative order. ***This only shows a deliberate attempt on the part of the bureaucracy to circumvent the order of the Court and stick to their stand. This is clear violation of the Court's order and the appellant is guilty of flouting the Court's order.***

17. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the view taken by the High Court does not call for interference.

18. While coming to the question of sentence, learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the incumbent is on the verge of retirement and he has suffered a lot and he has an unblemished career of 30 years of service. ***More so now order dated 25-2-1997 has been revoked though belatedly, therefore mercy be shown to him and his apology may be accepted. But if the Court's orders are flouted like this, then people will lose faith in the courts. Therefore, it is necessary to deal with such type of violation of the Court's order with strong hands and to convey to the authorities that the courts are not going to take things lightly.*** However, looking to the long career of this officer and now that the order has been revoked, we do not propose to punish him with imprisonment but we propose to impose a fine of Rs 5000 (Rupees five thousand) only and in default of payment of fine, to undergo simple imprisonment for one month. The incumbent shall deposit the amount in the State Treasury within one month from today. (emphasis supplied)

19. Hence, as a result we affirm the order of the High Court and punish Respondent 1 for committing contempt of court's order and impose a fine of Rs 5000 (Rupees five thousand) only, in default of payment of fine, sentence him to simple imprisonment for one month. The impugned order is modified to this extent. The civil appeal is disposed of accordingly."

32. Similarly, the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Union of India Vs.*

K.M. Shankarappa [(2001) 1 SCC 582] held as under:

"7. We are unable to accept the submission of the learned counsel. The Government has chosen to establish a quasi-judicial body which has been given the powers, inter alia, to decide the effect of the film on the public. Once a quasi-judicial body like the Appellate Tribunal, consisting of a retired Judge of a High Court or a person qualified to be a Judge of a High Court and other experts in the field, gives its decision that decision would be final and binding so far as the executive and the Government is concerned. **To permit the executive to review and/or revise that decision would amount to interference with the exercise of judicial functions by a quasi-judicial Board. It would amount to subjecting the decision of a quasi-judicial body to the scrutiny of the executive. Under our Constitution the position is reverse. The executive has to obey judicial orders. Thus, Section 6(1) is a travesty of the rule of law which is one of the basic structures of the Constitution. The legislature may, in certain cases, overrule or nullify a judicial or executive decision by enacting an appropriate legislation. However, without enacting an appropriate legislation, the executive or the legislature cannot set at naught a judicial order. The executive cannot sit in an appeal or review or revise a judicial order. The Appellate Tribunal consisting of experts decides matters quasi-judicially. A Secretary and/or Minister cannot sit in appeal or revision over those decisions. At the highest, the Government may apply to the Tribunal itself for a review, if circumstances so warrant. But the Government would be bound by the ultimate decision of the Tribunal.**" (emphasis supplied)

8. We fail to understand the apprehension expressed by the learned counsel that there may be a law and order situation. Once an expert body has considered the impact of the film on the public and has cleared the film, it is no excuse to say that there may be a law and order situation. It is for the State Government concerned to see that law and order is maintained. In any democratic society there are bound to be divergent views. Merely because a small section of the society has a different view, from that as taken by the Tribunal, and choose to express their views by unlawful

means would be no ground for the executive to review or revise a decision of the Tribunal. In such a case, the clear duty of the Government is to ensure that law and order is maintained by taking appropriate actions against persons who choose to breach the law.”

33. In the ***State of Himachal Pradesh and Another Vs. P.C. Sharma [(2019) SCC Online HP 2121]***, the Hon’ble Division Bench of the Hon’ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh had held as under:-

“9. Once the judgment has attained finality, then it is not open to the petitioners to argue what has been specifically held against them in the earlier litigation.

10. One important consideration of public policy is that the decision pronounced by the Court of competent jurisdiction should be final unless or until modified or reversed by the appellate authority and the very principle underlying the same is that no one should be made to face the same kind of litigation twice because such a process would be contrary to consideration of fair play and justice.”

34. Similarly, the Hon’ble Division Bench of Jammu & Kashmir and Ladakh at Srinagar in ***Ruksana, Jabeen Vs. State of JK and Ors in SWP No.3004 of 2018*** a/w connected matters dated 04.02.2023 held as under:

“27. It has been vehemently argued before us by learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that the respondents are denying the petitioners the benefit of concluded judgments passed by this Court on the ground that the same are incapable of being implemented in view of issuance of the impugned Government order.

28. *In the constitutional scheme that we have, the Executive is under an obligation to obey the judicial orders. The Legislature, may, in certain situations, nullify a judicial or executive decision by enacting appropriate legislation, however, absent such legislation, neither the Executive nor the Legislature could set aside a judicial order. Permitting the Executive to review, revise or sit over the decisions of the Court by issuing executive orders or instructions would be tantamount to interference with the exercise of judicial functions by the Judiciary.*

29 The issue was considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Union of India v. K.M.Sankarappa*, A (2001) 1 SCC 582 wherein a Division Bench of the Supreme Court even held the decisions of quasi-judicial Authorities like the Tribunals which are headed by a retired or sitting judge of the High Court are binding on the Executive and cannot be overruled or overturned by the Executive Authority by issuing Government orders or executive instructions. The issue of "legislative override and the scope of judicial review" is elaborately discussed by the Supreme Court in ***Madras Bar Association vs. Union of India, (2022) 12 SCC 455***. Paragraph (50) of the judgment authored by Justice L. Nageswara Rao to which Justice S. Ravindra Bhat has concurred by writing a separate judgment, is relevant for our purpose to some extent and is, thus, reproduced hereunder:

"50.The permissibility of legislative override in this country should be in accordance with the principles laid down by this Court in the aforementioned as well as other judgments, which have been culled out as under:

50.1) The effect of the judgments of the Court can be nullified by a legislative act removing the basis of the judgment. Such law can be retrospective. Retrospective amendment should be reasonable and not arbitrary and must not be violative of the fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution.

50.2) The test for determining the validity of a validating legislation is that the judgment pointing out the defect 49 (1995) 6 SCC 1650, P.

Sambamurthy&Ors. v. State of Andhra Pradesh &Anr. (1987) 1 SCC 362 51 Lohia Machines Ltd. &Anr. v. Union of India &Ors. (1985) 2 SCC 197 would not have been passed, if the altered position as sought to be brought in by the validating statute existed before the Court at the time of rendering its judgment. In other words, the defect pointed out should have been cured such that the basis of the judgement pointing out the defect is removed.

50.3) Nullification of mandamus by an enactment would be impermissible legislative exercise [See: S.R. Bhagwat (supra)]. Even interim directions cannot be reversed by a legislative veto [See: Cauvery Water Disputes Tribunal (supra) and Medical Council of India v. State of Kerala &Ors..

50.4) Transgression of constitutional limitations and intrusion into the judicial power by the legislature is violative of the principle of separation of powers, the rule of law and of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. Validity of the Impugned Ordinance"

30. The position of law has been explained by the Supreme Court in relation to the legislative override, ***whereas, we, in the present case, are confronted with executive override which, in any case, is not permissible in law. The Executive, as said above, is bound to comply with the orders of the Court and has no power, jurisdiction or competence to sit over or overturn such decision by mere executive fiat."***
(emphasis supplied)

Issue No.5:

35. As discussed herein above, One Sri N. Gulzar serving in the capacity of the Prl. Secretary to Government (CT) Finance, has passed the Impugned Order by deliberately discarding the findings given by the Learned Single Judge on both counts, as discussed herein above by referring the Order of the Learned Single Judge in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 dated 11.04.2022 as first

reference. The first reference of the Impugned Order, would indicate that the said the Secretary to Government (CT) Finance, though has read the Order, has decided to once again raise the very same objections which have attained finality in the 'eye of law'.

36. In this view of the matter, this Court is of the prima facie opinion that Sri N. Gulzar, Pri. Secretary to Government (CT) Finance, having no respect to the 'Constitutional Governance', is unfit to hold the position as a public servant at the 'pleasure' of the Government under Article 310 of the Constitution of India, as he has blatantly and explicitly exhibited utter disregard not only to the settled principles of law but also to the Orders passed by the Court of Record namely the High Court in as much as he 'sat in appeal' and passed an order thereby consciously frustrating a Judicial Verdict. By such conduct, he had violated the very inviolable 'Principal Doctrinal Barrier' which is the '*Laxman Rekha*' for the executive. The said Officer has made mockery of the 'Rule of Law' and the 'Separation of Powers'.

37. Anyone who wilfully disobeys, flouts and or frustrates the Orders of the Court, shall be liable for contempt. Prima-facie,

the facts herein would also indicate that Sri N. Gulzar, Prl. Secretary to Government (CT) Finance is not only unfit to hold an executive position in Government service but he has also rendered himself liable for Contempt of Court.

38. Accordingly, vide the analysis and the opinion of this Court under Issue Nos.4 and 5:

(i) there shall be a Show Cause Notice issued to Sri N. Gulzar, Prl. Secretary to Government (CT) Finance, as to why this Court should not direct the Government to terminate him from service on the premise that he is unfit to hold the job in Government service under Article 310 of the Constitution of India;

(ii) there shall also be a Show Cause Notice issued to Sri N. Gulzar, Prl. Secretary to Government (CT) Finance, as to why he shall not be prosecuted and be punished for contempt of this Court for wilful disobedience of the Orders passed by the Learned Single Judge in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 dated 11.04.2022.

39. In respect of the 1st Show Cause Notice in Para No.38 (i) above, Sri N. Gulzar, Prl. Secretary to Government (CT) Finance is directed to file his response within two weeks from today. In so far as the suo-moto Contempt Notice in Para No.38 (ii) is concerned, the Registry is directed to register a case for suo-moto Contempt of the Court under Sub-sections (b) and (c) (iii) of Section 2 of the Contempt of Courts Act and issue notice to Sri N. Gulzar, Prl. Secretary to Government (CT) Finance, Respondent No.1 herein returnable in two weeks from today. List the Contempt Case on 01.05.2024 along with this W.P.No.34079 of 2022 in the Motion List, for further enquiry in respect of 2 Show Cause Notices (per Para No.38 supra).

40. With the above findings, this Writ Petition stands allowed. Consequently, the Impugned Memo No.REV01-CCSTOCCTC/6/2022-CT-1, dated 05.07.2022 is set aside. There shall be a direction to the Respondents to adhere to the law as laid down by the Learned Single Judge in W.P.No.20266 of 2021 dated 11.04.2022 and pass fresh Orders on the Representation made by the Writ Petitioner on 29.04.2022 within four weeks from

the date of uploading of this Order on the Web-site of this Court.

No Order as to Costs.

41. Interlocutory Applications, if any, stand closed in terms
of this order.

**SD/- S SRINIVASA PRASAD
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

**One fair copy to the Hon'ble Sri Justice Gannamaneni Ramakrishna Prasad
(for His Lordship's Kind Perusal)**

To,

1. The Principle Secretary, Department of Revenue (Commercial Taxes), State of Andhra Pradesh, AP Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravati.
2. The Commissioner of State Tax (AP), Department of Commercial Taxes Office at Door No.5-59, R. K. Spring Valley Apartments, Bandar Road, Eedupugallu Village, Kankipadu Mandal.
3. The Joint Commissioner, Department of Commercial Taxes, Eluru Division, Eluru, West Godavari District.
4. The Deputy Commissioner, Department of Commercial Taxes, Eluru Division, Eluru, West Godavari District.
5. The Registrar (Judicial), High Court of Andhra Pradesh at Amaravati, Guntur District.
6. The Section Officer, New Filing Section, High Court of Andhra Pradesh.
7. The Section Officer, O.S. Section, High Court of Andhra Pradesh.
8. The Under Secretary, Union of India, Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, New Delhi.
9. The Secretary, A.P.Advocates' Association Library, High Court Buildings, High Court of Andhra Pradesh.
- 10.9 LR.Copies
- 11.One CC to Sri Dr Sastry Jandhyala, Advocate [OPUC]
- 12.Two CCs to GP for Services - I, High Court of Andhra Pradesh. [OUT]
- 13.Two CD Copies

RAM

MBT

Nazineen

HIGH COURT

DATED: 16/04/2024

ORDER

WP.No.34079 of 2022



**ALLOWING THE WP
WITHOUT COSTS**

25 Copies
SN
19/04/2024