

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH : AMARAVATI

W.A.Nos.602, 604, 610 & 636 of 2024

W.A.No.602 of 2024

Between:

1. The State Bank of India, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s

AND

1. P Rama Chandraiah, S/o Late Narasimhulu, aged about 60 years. Residing at Chandragiri, Chittoor District, Tirupathi

...Respondent

W.A.No.604 of 2024

Between:

1. THE STATE BANK OF INDIA, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s

AND

1. P RAMA KRISHNAIAH, S/o Late Narasimhulu, Aged about 60 years, R/o. Plot No.30, TUDA Plots, Opp.Sudhaha High School, Tirupathi.

2. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary to Government Social Welfare Department Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravathi.

3. The District Collector, Chittoor District, Chittoor.

4. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

5. The Mandal Revenue Officer/Tahsildar, Chandragiri Mandal, Chandragiri, Chittoor District.

...Respondents

W.A.No.610 of 2024**Between:**

1. The State Bank of India, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s**AND**

1. P Rama Chandraiah, S/o Late Narasimhulu, aged about 60 years. Residing at Chandragiri, Chittoor District, Tirupathi.

2. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary to Government Social Welfare Department Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravathi.

3. The District Collector, Chittoor District, Chittoor.

4. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

5. The Mandal Revenue Officer/Tahsildar, Chandragiri Mandal, Chandragiri, Chittoor District.

...Respondents**W.A.No.636 of 2024****Between:**

1. The State Bank of India, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s**AND**

1. P Rama Krishnaiah, S/o Late Narasimhulu, Aged about 60 years, R/o. Plot No.30, TUDA Plots, Opp.Sudhaha High School, Tirupathi.

...Respondent

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 16.10.2026

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D. RAMESH****AND****THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR**

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers
may be allowed to see the judgment?

Yes / No

2. Whether the copies of judgment may be marked to Law Reporters / Journals?

Yes / No

3. Whether His Lordship wish to see the fair copy of the Judgment?

Yes / No

JUSTICE D. RAMESH

JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR

*** THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH
&
*THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR**

+ W.A.Nos.602, 604, 610 & 636 of 2024

% 16.10.2026

W.A.No.602 of 2024

Between:

1. The State Bank of India, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s

AND

1. P Rama Chandraiah, S/o Late Narasimhulu, aged about 60 years. Residing at Chandragiri, Chittoor District, Tirupathi

...Respondent

W.A.No.604 of 2024

Between:

1. THE STATE BANK OF INDIA, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s

AND

1. P RAMA KRISHNAIAH, S/o Late Narasimhulu, Aged about 60 years, R/o. Plot No.30, TUDA Plots, Opp.Sudhaha High School, Tirupathi.

2. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secreatry to Government Social Welfare Deaprtment Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravathi.

3. The District Collector, Chittoor District, Chittoor.

4. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

5. The Mandal Revenue Officer/Tahsildar, Chandragiri Mandal, Chandragiri, Chittoor District.

...Respondents

W.A.No.610 of 2024**Between:**

1. The State Bank of India, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s**AND**

1. P Rama Chandraiah, S/o Late Narasimhulu, aged about 60 years. Residing at Chandragiri, Chittoor District, Tirupathi.

2. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary to Government Social Welfare Department Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravathi.

3. The District Collector, Chittoor District, Chittoor.

4. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

5. The Mandal Revenue Officer/Tahsildar, Chandragiri Mandal, Chandragiri, Chittoor District.

...Respondents**W.A.No.636 of 2024****Between:**

1. The State Bank of India, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi. Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s**AND**

1. P Rama Krishnaiah, S/o Late Narasimhulu, Aged about 60 years, R/o. Plot No.30, TUDA Plots, Opp.Sudhaha High School, Tirupathi.

...Respondent

! Counsel for Appellant/s : Sri G SUDHEER KUMAR, learned counsel for the Appellants

^ Counsel for Respondent/s : Sri **K V RAGHU VEER**, learned Counsel representing the learned counsel for the Respondents.

< Gist:**> Head Note:****? Cases referred:**

2022 SCC Online SC 1282

(2017) 8 SCC 670

Date of reserved for orders : 23.07.2026
 Date of pronouncement : 16.10.2026
 Date of uploading : 16.10.2026

APHC010159602024



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
 AT AMARAVATI**

FRIDAY, THE 16th DAY OF OCTOBER, 2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE D RAMESH

AND

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR

W.A.Nos.602, 604, 610 & 636 of 2024

W.A.No.602 of 2024

Between:

1. The State Bank of India, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s

AND

1. P Rama Chandraiah, S/o Late Narasimhulu, aged about 60 years. Residing at Chandragiri, Chittoor District, Tirupathi

...Respondent

**Counsel for the Petitioner: G SUDHEER KUMAR
 Counsel for the Respondents: K V RAGHU VEER
 Counsel for the Respondents:GP FOR SERVICES I
 Counsel for the Respondents:GP FOR SERVICES II**

W.A.No.604 of 2024**Between:**

1. THE STATE BANK OF INDIA, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s

AND

1. P RAMA KRISHNAIAH, S/o Late Narasimhulu, Aged about 60 years, R/o. Plot No.30, TUDA Plots, Opp.Sudhaha High School, Tirupathi.

2. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secreatry to Government Social Welfare Department Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravathi.

3. The District Collector, Chittoor District, Chittoor.

4. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

5. The Mandal Revenue Officer/Tahsildar, Chandragiri Mandal, Chandragiri, Chittoor District.

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner: G SUDHEER KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR SERVICES I

Counsel for the Respondents:GP FOR SERVICES II

W.A.No.610 of 2024**Between:**

1. The State Bank of India, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s

AND

1. P Rama Chandraiah, S/o Late Narasimhulu, aged about 60 years. Residing at Chandragiri, Chittoor District, Tirupathi.

2. The State of Andhra Pradesh, Rep. by its Principal Secretary to Government Social Welfare Department Andhra Pradesh Secretariat, Velagapudi, Amaravathi.

3. The District Collector, Chittoor District, Chittoor.

4. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Tirupathi, Chittoor District.

5. The Mandal Revenue Officer/Tahsildar, Chandragiri Mandal, Chandragiri, Chittoor District.

...Respondents

Counsel for the Petitioner: G SUDHEER KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondents: K V RAGHU VEER

Counsel for the Respondents:GP FOR SERVICES I

Counsel for the Respondents:GP FOR SERVICES II

W.A.No.636 of 2024

Between:

1. The State Bank of India, Rep. by The Asst. General Manager and Disciplinary Authority, Region-3, Zonal Officer, Tirupathi. Chittoor District.

...Appellant/s

AND

1. P Rama Krishnaiah, S/o Late Narasimhulu, Aged about 60 years, R/o. Plot No.30, TUDA Plots, Opp.Sudhaha High School, Tirupathi.

...Respondent

Counsel for the Petitioner: G SUDHEER KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent SIDDARTH C B

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D. RAMESH
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR

WRIT APPEAL Nos.602, 604, 610 AND 636 of 2024

COMMON JUDGMENT (As per Hon'ble Sri Justice Alapati Giridhar)

1. These Appeals are filed by the State Bank of India, Tirupati, assailing the Common Order passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.Nos.8158, 8439, 8882 & 8883 of 2004 dated 19.12.2023, wherein the Writs were allowed, setting aside the cancellation of two brothers' caste certificates, and also setting aside their dismissal from service.

I. BRIEF CONTENTIONS:

2. The learned counsel for the Appellant/SBI submits that the Order of the learned Single Judge is erroneous and contrary to law. As a question, whether the enquiry was conducted without an opportunity was given to the Writ Petitioners is to be considered and admittedly a show-cause notice was issued to them, on 19.07.2000, they submitted the explanation to the District Level Scrutiny Committee and appeared, along with school certificates. The proceedings of the 3rd Respondent/District Collector show that the Fair Shop Key Register maintained by the Tahsildar Office, Tirupati, discloses that the Caste of one of the Writ Petitioners/P.RamaKrishnaiah was recorded as 'Balija' in his ration card.

The Writ Petitioners participated in the enquiry and the question of no opportunity and violation of principles of natural justice does not arise. Whereas the learned Single Judge took an objection for non-consideration of the school certificates, which are submitted by the Petitioners. The enquiry conducted by the Tahsildar in the locality of Nehru Nagar, Tirupati ascertained that the family/surname of the petitioner's Caste as 'Balija' and he also married a girl of 'Balija' community but not SC community.

3. The learned counsel for the Appellant submits that even if there is any irregularity in the enquiry, the matter has to be remanded for adjudication, but the learned Single Judge erroneously set aside the Order on the ground of violation of principles of natural justice. Further, the learned Single Judge cannot pass the Order in these Writ Petitions directing to reinstate the Petitioners into service and pay the terminal/service benefits and the counsel prayed to allow the Appeals.

4. The learned Counsel for 1st Respondent/Writ Petitioners submits that the learned Single Judge rightly passed the Order and prays to dismiss the Appeals. The learned counsel submits that the case of the Bank is that the Assistant General Manager, S.B.I., Zonal Office, Tirupati, while enclosing an anonymous petition received by him, requested the Collector to verify the caste status, the report relied on the ground that the Caste of Sri P. Rama Krishnaiah is recorded as 'Balija' in the ration card and the discrete enquiry in the locality revealed that the Writ Petitioners' family is predominantly known as 'Balija' but did not consider

the educational record of the Writ Petitioners. Further, in the enquiry report was not furnished to the Writ Petitioners, so also the anonymous letter, the learned Single Judge rightly recorded that non-furnishing of the enquiry report and the letter violated the principles of natural justice and prayed to dismiss the Appeals.

II. WRITS AND BRIEF PRAYERS:

5. P. Rama Chandraiah filed two writ petitions i.e., W.P.No.8158 of 2004 and W.P.No.8883 of 2004:

1. Declaring the action of the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 in cancellation of the Petitioner's Caste Certificate under the impugned order dated 06.04.2004 is arbitrary, illegal and in violation of principles of natural justice.

2. Declaring the action of the Respondents by proceedings dated 29.04.2004 in dismissing the Petitioner from service is arbitrary, illegal and in violation of principles of natural justice.

6. P. Rama Krishnaiah filed two W.P.No.8439 of 2004 and W.P.No.8882 of 2004:

1. Declaring the action of the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 in cancellation of the Petitioner's Caste Certificate under the impugned order dated 06.04.2004 is arbitrary, illegal and in violation of principles of natural justice.

2. Declaring the action of the Respondents by proceedings dated 29.04.2004 in dismissing the Petitioner from service is arbitrary, illegal and in violation of principles of natural justice.

III. BRIEF FACTS IN THE WRITS:

i) Affidavit filed by P. Rama Chandraiah in the writ petitions i.e, W.P.No.8158 of 2004 and W.P.No.8882 of 2004:

7. The Writ Affidavit filed by P. Rama Chandraiah reveals that the case of the Bank/5th Respondent is that the Bank has received an anonymous petition alleging that P. Rama Chandraiah had obtained employment in the Bank by producing a false caste certificate. Consequently, the 5th Respondent submitted a requisition to the 2nd Respondent to verify the genuineness of the Caste Certificate and conduct an enquiry into his caste status. The 2nd Respondent, in turn, directed the 3rd Respondent to enquire into the matter. The 3rd Respondent conducted an enquiry through the Mandal Revenue Officer, Tirupati and submitted his report to the 2nd Respondent in the month of June 2000, stating that P. Rama Chandraiah did not belong to the Scheduled Caste community. The enquiry report was based on the following observations:

1. The caste of his younger brother was recorded as 'Balija' in the ration card.
2. He was residing in a locality predominantly inhabited by members of the 'Balija' community.

8. Based on the said enquiry report of the 3rd Respondent, the 2nd Respondent has canceled his Caste Certificate without properly considering his educational certificates and other relevant records. Subsequently, the 1st Respondent mechanically confirmed the cancellation without independently examining the matter and the relevant evidence.

9. Thereafter, a show-cause notice dated 11.10.2000 was served on the Writ Petitioner/P. Rama Chandraiah, calling upon him to submit his explanation. He subsequently approached the Government of Andhra Pradesh/1st Respondent pleaded to grant interim stay, however, his appeal was dismissed by 1st Respondent. As the 5th Respondent was allegedly attempting to remove him from his service, he filed the Writ Petition.

ii. Affidavit filed by P. Rama Krishnaiah in W.P.No.8439 of 2004 and W.P.No.8883 of 2004:

10. The Writ Affidavit filed by P. Rama Krishnaiah reveals that he pleaded on the same lines as of his brother/P. Rama Chandraiah.

IV. ANALYSIS

11. The contention of the Bank is that even if there is any irregularity in the enquiry, the matter has to be remanded for adjudication for principles of natural justice, but the learned Single Judge cannot pass the impugned order setting aside the cancellation of caste certificates of the Petitioners and consequently

directing to reinstate the Petitioners into service and to pay the terminal/service benefits.

12. The learned Single Judge recorded that the enquiry is vitiated for non-furnishing of enquiry report and anonymous letter to the Writ Petitioners, the findings and result of Writ Petitioners are extracted hereunder;

26. The manner in which the official respondents have arrived at the conclusion that the petitioners do not belong to the SC category is definitely not in accordance with the principles of natural justice and in accordance with Act 16 of 1993 and the rules thereunder. The Respondents 2 to 4 have not furnished copies of the alleged documents relied upon by them. The copy of the anonymous complaint alleged to have been received by the 5th Respondent is also not furnished by any of the respondents, and the copy of the enquiry report is admittedly not served on the petitioners.

27. In these circumstances, this Court has no hesitation to hold the enquiry conducted to determine the genuineness of the petitioners' case certificates are vitiated and against the principles of natural justice and hence deserves to be set aside.

28. Accordingly, G.O. Ms. Nos.32 and 33 Social Welfare (CVI) Department, dated 06.04.2004, issued by the 1st Respondent are hereby set aside and also the proceedings vide Staff Con. Nos. 103 and 160, dated 29.04.2004, issued by the 5th Respondent are also hereby set aside. However, the decision of the 5th Respondent in issuing the impugned proceedings Staff Con. Nos. 103 and 160, dated 29.04.2004 also cannot be found fault with as they had no other option than to the impugned orders in light of the District Collector canceling the caste petitioners.

29. These writ petitions are filed in the year 2004. By that time, the petitioner in W.P. No.8158 and 8883 of 2004 was aged 43 years and now he has attained the age of superannuation. By the time of filing the writ petition, the petitioner in W.P. No.8439 and 8882 of 2004 was aged 40

years and now he is on the verge of attaining the age of superannuation. Thus, the prayer for a direction to the respondents to reinstate the petitioner in W.P. No.8158 and 8883 of 2004 would not meet the ends of justice. However, a direction to reinstate the petitioner in W.P. No.8439 of 2004 and 8882 of 2004 would do some justice to the petitioner.

30. Accordingly, the 5th Respondent is directed to reinstate Sri. P.RamaKrishnaiah (petitioner in W.P.Nos.8439 and 8882 of 2004) within a period of 6 weeks from the date of receipt of this order. It is made clear that the period of termination shall be treated as on duty. However, Sri P.RamaKrishnaiah shall as on duty not been titled for any back wages. It is made clear that from the date of termination till the date of reinstatement, the said period shall be counted for service benefits only and not for back wages.

31. The order passed by the 5th respondent, terminating Sri P.Rama Chandraiah (petitioner in W.P.No.8158 and 8883 of 2004) is hereby set aside. The 5th Respondent is hereby directed to pay the terminal benefits by considering the period of termination of Sri P.RamaChandraiah from the date of termination till the date of his attaining superannuation as on duty. It is made clear that SriP.RamaChandraiah shall not be entitled for any back wages. However, he shall be entitled for retirement benefits accrued on account of his service till the date of retirement.

32. In the light of the above observations, these writ petitions are allowed without costs.

13. The primary contention of the Appellant/Bank is that the learned Singh Judge ought to have remanded the matter for fresh adjudication when the learned Single Judge recorded that the enquiry report is not furnished and the same is vitiated by the principles of natural justice, but ought not have allowed the Writs by setting aside the orders of cancellation of caste certificates.

14. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the ***Inspector of Panchayats and District Collector, Salem Vs S. Arichandran & others***¹, while dealing with departmental enquiry, held that the High Court ought to have remitted the case to the Authority to conduct the enquiry from the point that it stood vitiated and to conclude the same after furnishing a report as to give him opportunity, which are extracted hereunder;

15. At this stage, a recent decision of this Court in the case of ***Rajit Singh (supra)***, in which this Court had considered its earlier decision in the case of ***A. Masilamani (supra)*** is required to be referred to. In paragraph 15, it is observed and held as under:-

“15. It appears from the order passed by the Tribunal that the Tribunal also observed that the enquiry proceedings were against the principles of natural justice in as much as the documents mentioned in the charge sheet were not at all supplied to the delinquent officer. As per the settled proposition of law, in a case where it is found that the enquiry is not conducted properly and/or the same is in violation of the principles of natural justice, in that case, the Court cannot reinstate the employee as such and the matter is to be remanded to the Enquiry Officer/Disciplinary Authority to proceed further with the enquiry from the stage of violation of principles of natural justice is noticed and the enquiry has to be proceeded further after furnishing the necessary documents mentioned in the charge sheet, which are alleged to have not been given to the delinquent officer in the instant case. In the case of *Chairman, Life Insurance Corporation of India v. A.Masilamani*,

¹2022 SCC Online SC 1282

(2013) 6 SCC 530, which was also pressed into service on behalf of the appellants before the High Court, it is observed in paragraph 16 as under:—

16. It is a settled legal proposition, that once the court sets aside an order of punishment, on the ground that the enquiry was not properly conducted, the court cannot reinstate the employee. It must remit the case concerned to the disciplinary authority for it to conduct the enquiry from the point that it stood vitiated, and conclude the same. (Vide ECIL v. B. Karunakar [(1993) 4 SCC 727], HiranMayee Bhattacharyya v. S.M. School for Girls [(2002) 10 SCC 293], U.P. State Spg. Co. Ltd. v. R.S. Pandey [(2005) 8 SCC 264] and Union of India v. Y.S. Sadhu [(2008) 12 SCC 30]).”

16. Applying the law laid down by this Court in the aforesaid decisions to the facts of the case on hand and as the order of dismissal has been set aside on the ground that the same was in breach of principles of Natural Justice, the High Court ought to have remitted the case concerned to the Disciplinary Authority to conduct the inquiry from the point that it stood vitiated and to conclude the same after furnishing a copy of the Inquiry Report to the delinquent and to give opportunity to the delinquent to submit his comments on the Inquiry Officer's Report.

15. Thus, in view of the law, the learned Single Judge ought to have remanded the matter for fresh adjudication to follow the principles of natural justice in the enquiry, but the learned Single Judge set aside the orders of cancellation of caste certificates of the Writ Petitioners and consequently directed the Bank to reinstate/release the terminal benefits to the Writ Petitioners. Thus,

the impugned Common Order of the learned Single Judge warrants interference in the Appeal.

V.Law on false Caste Certificate and Burden of Proof on the Claimant etc

16. The Hon'ble Full Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Chairman and Managing Director, FCI and ors v.Jagdish Balaram Bahira and ors***², while dealing with The Maharashtra Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, De-Notified Tribes (VimuktaJatis), Nomadic Tribes, Other Backward Classes and Special Backward Category (Regulation of Issuance and Verification of) Caste Certificate Act, 2000, observed on the policy of affirmative action, Reservation of posts in public employment and seats for admission in educational institutions, exploiting with false caste certificates, held it constitutes a fraud on the Constitution. Also, it is a fraud on State policy, observed on the powers of the Scrutiny Committee and burden of proof on the Claimant, withdrawal of the benefits and recovery, Criminal Prosecution etc.

17. The Andhra Pradesh (Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Classes) Regulation of Issue of Community Certificates Act, 1993, for short 'Act', deals with powers of the Scrutiny Committee, burden of proof on the Claimant, withdrawal of benefits availed on false caste certificates, their recovery and Criminal prosecution etc.,

²(2017) 8 SCC 670

18. It is needless to mention that, as per Section 6 of the Act, the burden of proof is on the Claimant to prove that he belongs to such caste.

19. Generally, the Claimant needs to submit a detailed family tree mentioning the name of their great-grandfather and great-grandmother, their siblings, their names, marriage, residences and also their education and employment particulars, along with their caste certificates to the extent available.

20. Also need to submit details of the Claimant's grandfather and grandmother, father, mother, his brothers and sisters, if any, also his brothers' and sisters' children, their names, marriage, residences, education, employment and their caste certificates etc., so as to discharge the burden on the Claimant by challenging the other party by filing the documents to the extent possible, to ensure verification of the details, to ascertain all these in the enquiry in support of his claim.

21. Even if the Claimant fails to file all these particulars, the concerned Authorities have a duty to draw a family tree with all these particulars as stated supra, including all their caste certificates, marriage photos/videos, social media etc., with electronic evidence to arrive at a just conclusion in an enquiry.

22. In the technology era, both parties are supposed to collect the data with family tree to assist the Authority.

23. It is needless to mention that, as per Section 11 of the Act, the benefits secured on the basis of a false community certificate are to be withdrawn, either in education or employment or both. The Act also contemplates their recovery, and criminal prosecutions apart from provisions of IPC/BNS of the concerned including the abettors, depending on the facts of each case.

24. It is needless to mention that on finding a case of a false community certificate, the Authorities shall also examine to verify the caste certificates of the family members, Ascendant and Descendant order, to proceed as per law.

VI. CONCLUSION:

25. Thus, the Writ Appeals are allowed, setting aside the Common Order of the learned Single Judge in W.P.Nos.8158, 8439, 8882 & 8883 of 2004 dated 19.12.2023 and remanding the matter to the District Level Scrutiny Committee for fresh consideration as per law.

26. The Writ Petitioners are directed to appear before the District Level Scrutiny Committee, in turn, the Committee shall furnish all the documents, including the enquiry report, to give the Writ Petitioners an opportunity to submit the material in support of their case as per law. The Committee shall dispose of the matter expeditiously within 3 months from the date of receipt of this Order.

27. The Court is making it clear that the Court did not express on the merits of the case of the Parties or on Caste Certificates. The Authorities shall proceed with the case on its merits, uninfluenced by the observations, if any.

As a sequel, all miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE D. RAMESH

JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR

Date : .10.2026
CHD

Whether the order is :

Speaking Yes/No / Reasoned Yes/No

Reportable Yes/No / Non-Reportable Yes/No

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE D. RAMESH
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE ALAPATI GIRIDHAR

WRIT APPEAL Nos.602, 604, 610 and 636 of 2024

Date: 16th October, 2026