

*** THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI**
*** THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHENDU SAMANTA**

WRIT PETITION NO: 12292/2026

% 19.06.2026

A. Rajasekhar Gowd

.....petitioner

And:

\$ Union of India & 3 others

.... respondents

!Counsel for the petitioner : Sri A.N.S.Venkatesh

^Counsel for the respondents : Sri Y.Vivekananda

<Gist:

>Head Note:

? Cases referred:

1. (2024) 4 SCC 696

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

* * * *

WRIT PETITION NO: 12292/2026

Between:

A. Rajasekhar Gowd

..... PETITIONER

AND

Union of India & 3 others

....RESPONDENTS

DATE OF JUDGMENT RESERVED :

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED : 19.06.2026

DATE OF JUDGMENT UPLOADED : .06.2026

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

&

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHENDU SAMANTA

- | | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers may be allowed to see the Judgments? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reporters/Journals | Yes/No |
| 3. Whether Your Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

RAVI NATH TILHARI,J

SUBHENDU SAMANTA,J

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHENDU SAMANTA

WRIT PETITION NO: 12292/2026

ORDER: *(per Ravi Nath Tilhari, J)*

Heard Sri A.N.S.Venkatesh, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Y.Vivekananda, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.1 to 4.

2. Against the writ petitioner the remitting order was passed. Challenging those proceedings, the petitioner filed O.A.No.424 of 2026. He also prayed for grant of interim relief.

3. The Central Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad (Telangana) by order dated 23.04.2026 rejected the prayer for interim relief. The order reads as under:

“Heard Mr.ANS Venkatesh, learned counsel for the applicant.
Admit
Interim Relief, as sought in the O.A., is rejected.
Issue notice to the respondents.
Four weeks’ time is granted to the respondents to file a reply in the matter.
List the case, on 23.07.2026, before the Registrar’s Court, for completion of pleadings.
A copy of today’s order to be sent to the respondents through email, to enable them to file reply, to support speedy adjudication and disposal.”

4. Writ Petition has been filed with the following prayer:

“....to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ directing the Respondents to stay all the further departmental proceedings against the petitioner pursuant to the remitting order of the 3rd Respondent passed vide F.No.ARSGA/Vig/PCIT/TPT/2025-2026 dated 20.11.2025 under Rule 15(1) of the CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965 till the Central Administrative Tribunal considers and passes appropriate orders in OA No 424/2026 while declaring the rejection order dated

23/04/2026 as arbitrary illegal and violative of principles of natural justice and pass.”

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order is a non-speaking order and by just one line, prayer for interim relief has been rejected.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the Tribunal has fixed a short date and the matter is listed before the Tribunal on 23.07.2026 for completion of pleadings.

7. We have considered the aforesaid submissions and perused the impugned order.

8. The impugned order as extracted above makes it evident that the order is a non speaking order to reject the interim relief. No reason has been assigned for rejection of the interim relief. The case of the parties has not even been considered.

9. It is well settled in law that a judicial order must contain the reasons. The reasons are the back bone of every order. In ***Asma Lateef v. Shabbir Ahmad***¹, the Hon’ble Apex Court held that “The supreme requirement of a good judgment is reason. Judgment is of value on the strength of its reason. The weight of a judgment, its binding character or its persuasive character depends on the presentation and articulation of reason. Reason, therefore, is the soul and spirit of a good judgment.”

¹ (2024) 4 SCC 696

10. Para Nos.57 & 58 in **Asma Lateef** (supra) reads as under:

57. We deem it fit to advert to the fine words of wisdom imparted to us by Hon'ble P.B. Mukharji, C.J., in *The New Jurisprudence : The Grammar of Modern Law* where the learned author says:

“The supreme requirement of a good judgment is reason. Judgment is of value on the strength of its reason. The weight of a judgment, its binding character or its persuasive character depends on the presentation and articulation of reason. Reason, therefore, is the soul and spirit of a good judgment.”

58. It is one of the cardinal principles of the justice delivery system that any verdict of a competent judicial forum in the form of a judgment/order, that determines the rights and liabilities of the parties to the proceedings, must inform the parties what is the outcome and why one party has succeeded and not the other — the “why” constituting the reasons and “what” the conclusion. Apart from anything else, insistence of the requirement for the reason(s) to support the conclusion guarantees application of mind by the adjudicator to the materials before it as well as provides an avenue to the unsuccessful party to test the reasons before a higher court.”

11. The impugned order is unsustainable on such ground.

12. Only, on the aforesaid ground, we allow the writ petition and quash that part of the impugned order dated 23.04.2026 by which the interim relief has been rejected.

13. The Tribunal shall reconsider the prayer for interim relief in accordance with law by affording opportunity of hearing to both the sides and expeditiously, if possible on the next date i.e., 23.07.2026 and if so not possible for some justifiable reasons, the interim prayer shall be considered and decided within next one week from the date fixed positively.

14. The Writ Petition stands allowed with the aforesaid observations and directions.

15. It is made clear that this Court has not observed anything on the merits of the matter/interim prayer, either way.

No order as to costs.

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

RAVI NATH TILHARI,J

SUBHENDU SAMANTA,J

Dated:19.06.2026
Note: L.R. copy be marked
B/o.
AG

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHENDU SAMANTA

WRIT PETITION NO: 12292/2026

Dated:19.06.2026
Note: L.R. copy be marked
B/o.
AG