

[2026 LiveLaw \(SC\) 263](#)

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
EXTRA-ORDINARY APPELLATE JURISDICTION
PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA; J., N.V. ANJARIA; J.
SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) No . 9922 OF 2026; 13 March, 2026
(Arising out of SLP (Civil) Diary No. 70116/2025)
THE STATE OF TELANGANA & ORS. versus P SRINIVAS

Service Law – Accelerated Promotion – Counter-Extremism/Naxal Activities – Parity in Treatment – Judicial Review of Committee Decisions – The Supreme Court upheld the High Court’s direction to grant accelerated promotion to a police constable (Respondent) who resisted a Naxalite attack on a police station - The State had denied the promotion claiming the Respondent's role was "nominal" compared to a colleague (G. Venkat Reddy) who received the benefit – Supreme Court found the Committee’s assessment "perverse" as it was admitted that the Respondent, while on roof-top guard sentry duty, fired more rounds at the Naxalites than the promoted colleague and was instrumental in repelling the attack - Held, when collective efforts repel an attack, it is unfair to belittle the role of individual personnel to deny them benefits intended to boost the morale of the force - While the Court’s intervention in decisions taken by specialized Committees for out-of-turn promotion is minimal, such decisions are not immune to interference if they are found to be unfair or based on perverse findings – Appeal dismissed. [Relied on State of Madhya Pradesh & Anr. vs. Sanjay Shukla (Civil Appeal No. 2040 of 2023, decided on March 27, 2023; Paras 9, 10]

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 05-07-2024 in WA No. 699/2024 passed by the High Court for The State of Telangana at Hyderabad]

For Petitioner(s): Mr. K Ravindra Kumar, A.S.G. Ms. Devina Sehgal, AOR Mr. Yatharth Kansal, Adv.

ORDER

1. Delay condoned.
2. This petition would call in question the order passed by the Single Judge, duly affirmed by the Division Bench of the High Court, allowing the Writ Petition preferred by the respondent, directing the petitioner(s) to extend the benefit of accelerated promotion to the respondent as Head Constable, with effect from the date on which G. Venkat Reddy (P.C. No.2058) was promoted.
3. At the relevant time, respondent and the said G. Venkat Reddy (P.C. No.2058) were posted at Bommala Ramaram Police Station. In the night of 30.01.1999, Naxalites of CPI(ML) attacked the said police station and the respondent along with other police men resisted the said attack.
4. The petitioner(s) has issued G.O. from time to time, for grant of accelerated promotion to the police personnel, with a view to improve the morale in the police force; to such police personnel who have been involved in countering extremism/Naxal activities.
5. Based on the said G.O., G. Venkat Reddy (P.C. No.2058) was given accelerated promotion, giving rise to representations by the respondent, which were rejected, which led to filing of the Writ Petition before the High Court. The concerned authority of the petitioner(s) rejected respondent’s prayer for grant of accelerated promotion on the ground that the role played by him was nominal as compared to others including G. Venkat Reddy (P.C. No.2058), however, the Single Judge while allowing the Writ Petition has opined that on the date when the Naxalites attacked the police station, the respondent was on roof-

top guard sentry duty and has fired more rounds on Naxalites than G. Venkat Reddy (P.C. No.2058) and thereby helped in reducing the impact of the attack and also made the Naxalites to retreat. Had the respondent did not act bravely at the time of incident, there would have been much loss to the police station including loss of lives of many police personnel. Since, the attack was repelled with the collective efforts of the personnel on duty, they should be treated uniformly and it is not fair to reduce the importance of the role played by each of them at the time of such crisis.

6. Learned Single Judge of the High Court noted and rejected the submission of the petitioner's counsel that grant of accelerated promotion is a discretionary power of the Director General of Police, which should not be ordinarily interfered with, and the Division Bench of the High Court has affirmed the order of Single Judge under the impugned order.

7. It is argued, on the strength of order passed by this Court on March 27, 2023 in Civil Appeal No.2040 of 2023 in the matter of "*State of Madhya Pradesh & Anr. vs. Sanjay Shukla*", that when the Committee has considered the case for out of promotion and the process is found to be fair, just and equitable, the Committee's decision should not be interfered.

8. The case of *the State of Madhya Pradesh & Anr. vs. Sanjay Shukla*, relied on by learned counsel for the petitioner(s) has not laid down a law that decision taken by the Committee can never be interfered with. What this Court has observed is that when such decision is taken by the Committee, the Court's intervention is minimal.

9. In the case at hand, the respondent and G. Venkat Reddy (P.C. No.2058) including others, were posted on duty in the same police station and it is admitted during the course of argument today that the finding recorded by the Single Judge that the respondent has fired more rounds than G. Venkat Reddy (P.C. No.2058) is correct. If that be so, the High Court is entirely justified in interfering with the matter for the reason that the finding of the Committee that the respondent's role in the incident was nominal is perverse. When admittedly the respondent has fired more rounds and was instrumental in repelling the attack by the Naxalites in the police station, his role cannot be belittled for denial of accelerated promotion.

10. The object of giving accelerated promotion, as stated in the G.O., is to lift the morale of the police personnel. Therefore, keeping in view the object of giving accelerated promotion to counter Naxalites attack, the High Court was clearly justified in giving effect to the object of the G.O. by granting accelerated promotion to the respondent.

11. In view of the above, we do not find any ground to interfere with the impugned order.

12. Accordingly, the Special Leave Petition is dismissed.

13. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.