

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA  
AT HYDERABAD**

**TUESDAY, THE TWENTY FIRST DAY OF APRIL  
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX**

**PRESENT**

**THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE APARESH KUMAR SINGH  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE G.M. MOHIUDDIN**

**WA.Nos.284 AND 285 OF 2026**

**WA NO: 284 OF 2026**

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent Against the Order Dated 02/12/2025 in W.P No. 13420 of 2021 on the file of the High Court.

**Between:**

P.V. Narasimha Rao Telangana Veterinary University, Rep. by its Registrar,  
Rajendranagar, Hyderabad

**...APPELLANT**

**AND**

1. Ravi Gugulothu, S/o Bichya aged 38 years Occ. Assistant Professor (FRM) on contract basis College of Fishery Sciences Pebbair, Wanaparthy District
2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary to Government Animal Husbandry, Dairy and Fisheries Hyderabad
3. T.N. Devanand, S/o Nagaiah Occ. Assistant Professor (FRM) College of Fishery Sciences Pebbair, Wanaparthy District

**...RESPONDENTS**

**I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026**

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 suspend the operation of order in W.P.No. 13420 of 2021 dated 02.12.2025.

**Counsel for the Appellant : SRI M.SURENDER RAO, Senior Counsel  
for SRI AKA VENKATARAMANA**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1 : SRI RAMESH BABU VISHWANATHULA**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : GP FOR ANIMAL HUSBANDRY**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.3 : SRI G.L. NARASIMHAM FOR  
Dr.K.SHANKARA NARAYANA**

**WA NO: 285 OF 2026**

Writ Appeal under clause 15 of the Letters Patent Against Order Dated 01/12/2025 in  
WP No 13507 of 2021 on the file of the High Court.

**Between:**

P.V. Narasimha Rao Telangana Veterinary University, Rep. by its Registrar,  
Rajendranagar, Hyderabad

**...APPELLANT**

**AND**

1. Banothu Raveender, S/o B. Kotya aged 30 years Occ. Assistant Professor (AEM) on contract basis College of Fishery Sciences Pebbair. Wanaparthy District
2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary to Government Animal Husbandry, Dairy and Fisheries Hyderabad
3. Muttappa Khavi, S/o Siddappa Khavi Occ. Assistant Professor AEM College of Fishery Sciences Pebbair, Wanaparthy District

**...RESPONDENTS**

**I.A. NO: 1 OF 2026**

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 suspend the operation of order in W.P.No. 13507 of 2021 dated 02.12.2025.

**Counsel for the Appellant : SRI M.SURENDER RAO, Senior Counsel  
for SRI AKA VENKATARAMANA**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.1 : SRI RAMESH BABU VISHWANATHULA**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : GP FOR ANIMAL HUSBANDRY**

**Counsel for the Respondent No.3 : SRI G.L. NARASIMHAM FOR  
Dr.K.SHANKARA NARAYANA**

**The Court made the following: JUDGMENT**

**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA  
AT HYDERABAD**

**THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH  
AND**

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.M.MOHIUDDIN**

**WRIT APPEAL Nos.284 and 285 of 2026**

**DATE: 21.04.2026**

**W.A.No.284 of 2026**

**Between:**

P.V. Narasimha Rao Telangana  
Veterinary University  
Rep. by its Registrar,  
Rajendranagar, Hyderabad

**....Appellant**

**And**

Ravi Gugulothu and 2 others

**....Respondents**

**W.A.No.285 of 2026**

**Between:**

P.V. Narasimha Rao Telangana  
Veterinary University  
Rep. by its Registrar,  
Rajendranagar, Hyderabad

**....Appellant**

**And**

Banothu Raveender and 2 others

**....Respondents**

**COMMON JUDGMENT**

Since the issues that arise in the above writ appeals are integrally one and the same, the writ appeals are being disposed of by this Common Judgment.

**2.** These two writ appeals arise out of a common order dated 02.12.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.Nos.13507

of 2021 and 13420 of 2021. By the said common order, both the writ petitions were allowed directing the appellant-University to appoint the respondents (writ petitioners) as Assistant Professors in the faculty of Fishery Science, with notional seniority on par with the private respondents i.e., respondent No.3 in each appeal, while permitting the private respondents to continue in service.

3. Heard Sri M.Surender Rao, learned Senior Counsel appearing for Sri A.Venkataramana, learned counsel for the appellant; Sri V.Ramesh Babu, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.1 in both the matters (writ petitioners in W.P.Nos.13420 and 13507 of 2021 respectively) and Sri G.L.Narasimham, learned counsel representing Dr. K.Shankara Narayana, learned counsel for respondent No.3 in both the matters and perused the record.

**Factual matrix (in brief)**

4. The appellant-University issued Advertisement No.01/RC/2020 dated 17.08.2020 inviting applications for various teaching posts, including seven posts of Assistant Professors in different disciplines of Fishery Science. The present controversy is confined to two posts, namely:

- i) Assistant Professor in Fisheries Resource Management (FRM)  
– one post under Open Category (OC);
- ii) Assistant Professor in Aquatic Environment Management (AEM) – one post under Open Category (OC).

5. The essential qualifications prescribed for the post of Assistant Professor were:

1. A Bachelor's degree in Fishery Science.
  2. Good academic record with M.F.Sc. degree with at least 70% marks or an equivalent grade in a ten point scale, wherever grading system is followed, at the Master's Degree level in the concerned subject from an Indian University or an equivalent degree from an accredited foreign university
  3. Minimum marks required in PG degree would be 65% or equivalent grade for SC/ST/Differently-abled (VH/HH/OH differently-abled) candidates
  4. A pass in the National Eligibility Test (NET) conducted by the ICAR/UGC/CSIR or similar test accredited by the UGC like SLET/SEF
  5. NET is not required in case of the candidates possessing PhD that is acquired both by course work and research.
  6. Knowledge of Telugu language is preferable.
6. The selection process was governed by G.O.Ms.No.15 dated 29.06.2019 issued by the Government of Telangana, adopting the UGC Revised Pay Scales, 2016. In terms thereof, no written examination was prescribed. The assessment of candidates was on a 100-point scale, comprising 80 marks for academic performance based on self-assessment as per Table 3A of the said G.O., taking into account graduation, post-graduation, Ph.D., NET, research

publications, and teaching experience and 20 marks for interview, bifurcated into 10 marks for oral interview and 10 marks for teaching skills.

**7.** In response to the notification, 15 applications were received for the FRM post, out of which 14 candidates were found eligible and called for interview. For the AEM post, 12 applications were received, of which 9 candidates were found eligible and called for interview. The interviews were conducted on 16.04.2021 and 17.04.2021 by a duly constituted Selection Committee in accordance with Rule 2.1.1 of G.O.Ms.No.15. The Selection Committee prepared a panel of two candidates for each post, being 50% more than the notified vacancies. In W.A.No.284 of 2026, the respondent No.3 secured first rank with 88.14 marks, while the respondent No.1 (writ petitioner) secured second rank with 60.60 marks. Similarly, in W.A.No.285 of 2026, the respondent No.3 secured first rank with 88.14 marks, while the respondent No.1 (writ petitioner) secured second rank with 60.60 marks.

**8.** During the interview process, the Selection Committee assessed the Telugu language proficiency of the private respondents by interacting with them in Telugu and requiring them to read printed material in Telugu, which they performed satisfactorily. However, in the absence of documentary proof evidencing Telugu proficiency, the appellant-University, while issuing appointment orders dated 31.05.2021, imposed a condition

that the selected candidates shall pass the Telugu language test conducted by the Telangana State Public Service Commission (TSPSC) within a period of three years from the date of joining, failing which their annual increments would be withheld and their probation would not be declared.

**9.** The respondent No.1 (in each writ appeal), who had been working as contractual teaching faculty in the same college since 2017, assailed the appointments of the private respondents by filing W.P.Nos.13507 and 13420 of 2021, contending as under:

- i) That knowledge of Telugu was, in effect, a mandatory qualification;
- ii) That the private respondents, being from the State of Karnataka, did not possess the requisite knowledge of Telugu;
- iii) That the selection process lacked transparency, particularly as no merit list was published;
- iv) That the award of 30 marks for Ph.D. was arbitrary and contrary to the notification, as Ph.D. was not an essential qualification; and
- v) That the imposition of a condition in the appointment orders amounted to an impermissible relaxation of essential eligibility criteria.

**10.** The learned Single Judge, by a common order dated 02.12.2025, allowed both writ petitions primarily on the ground that the condition imposed in the appointment orders conferred a "mandatory character" upon the requirement of Telugu language proficiency, which was not contemplated under the notification

dated 17.08.2020. It was held that the appellant-University had traversed beyond the terms of the notification by effecting conditional appointments. Consequently, a direction was issued to appoint the writ petitioners as Assistant Professors with notional seniority from the same date as the private respondents, while permitting the private respondents to continue in service on humanitarian considerations.

**11.** Aggrieved by the said common order, the appellant-University has preferred the present writ appeals.

**Submissions on behalf of the appellant-University**

**12.** Learned counsel appearing for the appellant, advanced his submissions assailing the impugned common order dated 02.12.2025 as under:

i) That the notification dated 17.08.2020 expressly stipulated that “knowledge of Telugu language is preferable” and not “mandatory” or “essential.” It was submitted that the expression “preferable” denotes a desirable attribute and cannot be construed as a condition precedent to eligibility. It is argued that the learned Single Judge, erred in construing the conditional stipulation in the appointment order as conferring a mandatory character upon the requirement.

ii) That the entire selection process was conducted in a fair, transparent, and objective manner, strictly in conformity

with G.O.Ms.No.15 dated 29.06.2019. The Selection Committee was duly constituted in accordance with the governing statutory framework. Candidates were evaluated on the basis of uniform and objective criteria through self-assessment score cards, followed by interview. A panel was prepared wherein the private respondents were ranked first and the writ petitioners second.

- iii) That the applicable Regulations required preparation of a panel comprising 50% more candidates than the notified vacancies, which requirement was duly complied with. The allegation regarding non-preparation of a merit list is factually incorrect; the merit list was indeed prepared, and there was no requirement under the governing rules to publish the same.
- iv) That the award of 30 marks for Ph.D. is traceable directly to Table 3A of G.O.Ms.No.15, which specifically allocates 30 marks for Ph.D. under the relevant column. It was submitted that the writ petitioners themselves had submitted self-assessment score cards claiming marks under the very same evaluation framework and, having participated in the process with full knowledge thereof, cannot now assail the same upon being unsuccessful.

- v) That the scope of interference under Article 226 of the Constitution in matters of selection is limited. In the absence of established *mala fides* or patent illegality, the Court cannot sit in appeal over the recommendations of a duly constituted Selection Committee. It was further contended that although allegations of *mala fides* were raised against the then Registrar and Dean, neither were they impleaded as parties nor was any cogent material placed on record to substantiate such allegations. That, mere bald assertions are insufficient to vitiate an otherwise lawful selection process.
- vi) That the learned Single Judge committed a jurisdictional error in directing appointment of the writ petitioners when only one post was notified in each category, which effectively results in creation of supernumerary posts without sanction from the competent authority. It was submitted that even assuming any infirmity in the selection, the proper course would have been to set aside the selection and direct a fresh process, and not to appoint the second-ranked candidates.
- vii) That a candidate who participates in a selection process with full knowledge of the eligibility conditions and evaluation criteria cannot subsequently challenge the same after being declared unsuccessful. The writ petitioners, having voluntarily participated in the process and submitted self-

assessment score cards without demur, are estopped from questioning the selection of the private respondents.

- viii) That the earlier notification dated 17.03.2018 pertained to a general recruitment covering multiple faculties, whereas the present notification dated 17.08.2020 was specifically confined to the Faculty of Fishery Science. It was submitted that the omission of any elaborate stipulation regarding conditional appointment in the latter notification was conscious and deliberate cannot be supplied by way of implication.

**Submissions on behalf of the respondent No.1 in both writ appeals (writ petitioners)**

13. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents (writ petitioners), supported the impugned common order and contended that the same does not warrant interference and advanced the submissions as under:

- i) That notwithstanding the use of the expression "preferable" in the notification, the condition imposed in the appointment orders requiring the private respondents to pass the TSPSC Telugu language test within three years, failing which increments would be withheld and probation not declared, clearly demonstrates that Telugu knowledge was, in substance, treated as mandatory. It was argued that the

appellant-University cannot be permitted to adopt inconsistent positions between the notification and the appointment orders.

- ii) That in the earlier notification for similar posts, the appellant-University had expressly provided that candidates lacking Telugu knowledge could be considered only in the absence of eligible Telugu-knowing candidates, and even then subject to passing the Telugu test within a stipulated period. It was contended that the omission of such elaboration in the 2020 notification does not dilute the underlying requirement, particularly when the very same condition was incorporated in the appointment orders.
- iii) That the selection process was vitiated by lack of transparency, inasmuch as the merit list and individual marks were not disclosed. Such non-disclosure deprived the writ petitioners of the opportunity to verify the fairness of the selection. It was submitted that public employment demands adherence to the highest standards of transparency, which were not met in the present case.
- iv) That for the post of Assistant Professor, NET is the prescribed qualification, whereas Ph.D. merely operates as an exemption from NET. It is contended that the allocation of 30 marks for Ph.D. under Table 3A confers a

disproportionate advantage upon Ph.D. holders, thereby virtually elevating it to a mandatory requirement. The writ petitioners, being NET-qualified but not Ph.D. holders, were thereby placed at a comparative disadvantage, and exclusion of such marks for PhD would materially alter the merit position.

- v) That in respect of a single post in a State University, preference ought to be accorded to local candidates, particularly when fully qualified candidates possessing knowledge of Telugu were available within the State. The selection of candidates from Karnataka, who allegedly did not possess demonstrable Telugu proficiency at the relevant point of time, should not have been preferred over local candidates.
- vi) That the Dean of Faculties was associated with the Board of Management of Karnataka Veterinary University and that the Registrar hailed from Andhra Pradesh, thereby giving rise to a reasonable apprehension of bias in favour of candidates from Karnataka. It is contended that the surrounding circumstances cast a cloud on the fairness of the selection process.

**Submissions on behalf of the respondent No.3 in both writ appeals (writ petitioners)**

**14.** Learned counsel appearing for the respondents (writ petitioners), while adopting the submissions advanced on behalf of the appellant–University advanced further submissions as under:

- i) That the private respondents had knowledge of Telugu, and have, in fact, passed the Telugu language test conducted by TSPSC in the year 2023, thereby fulfilling the requirement relating to Telugu proficiency, and consequently, the writ petitions have been rendered infructuous.
- ii) That the private respondents have been discharging duties as Assistant Professors since the year 2021, and their appointments ought not to be unsettled after a considerable lapse of time, particularly in the absence of any proven *mala fides*.
- iii) That the private respondents possess superior academic credentials, including Ph.D. qualifications, and had secured significantly higher marks (88.14 as against 60.60) in comparison to the writ petitioners. Any interference with their selection on the ground of Telugu language requirement would undermine the principle of merit.

**15.** We have taken note of the respective submissions urged and the material placed on record.

### **Consideration by this Court**

**16.** A perusal of the notification dated 17.08.2020, issued under the caption "*Assistant Professor / Equivalent Cadres in the Faculty of Fishery Science,*" would disclose that, after prescribing the essential educational qualifications, it stipulates that "knowledge of Telugu language is preferable." The expression "preferable," in its plain and ordinary meaning, denotes something that is desirable or advantageous, but not obligatory. It cannot be equated with expressions such as "essential," "mandatory," or "shall possess," which ordinarily signify a condition precedent to eligibility. The conscious employment of the term "preferable" by the recruiting authority indicates that while knowledge of Telugu would operate as an added advantage, its absence would not render a candidate ineligible for consideration.

**17.** The learned Single Judge proceeded on the footing that the stipulation contained in the appointment orders requiring the selected candidates to pass the Telugu language test within a period of three years, imparted a "mandatory character" to the said requirement, which does not commend acceptance, for the following reasons:

- i. It is a settled principle that the terms of the recruitment notification constitute the governing framework for determining eligibility, and any subsequent administrative action must be construed in consonance therewith. The

appointment order, being consequential in nature, cannot enlarge or alter the eligibility criteria prescribed in the notification. The condition requiring the private respondents to pass a Telugu language test within a stipulated period cannot be construed as retrospectively converting a non-mandatory qualification into an essential one. Significantly, if knowledge of Telugu been an indispensable eligibility condition, the private respondents would not have been considered eligible for interview in the first instance. The fact that they were subjected to an assessment of Telugu proficiency during the interview and were found satisfactory further reinforces the position that the requirement was not disqualifying in nature.

- ii. The explanation offered by the appellant-University to the effect that the condition was imposed by way of precaution in the absence of documentary proof of Telugu proficiency, despite the Selection Committee being satisfied with the candidates' working knowledge, appears both plausible and consistent with administrative practice. Such a stipulation cannot be construed as evidencing any departure from the terms of the notification.
- iii. It is not uncommon in public employment, particularly in States having a distinct regional language, to prescribe post-appointment conditions requiring candidates to acquire or

demonstrate proficiency in the local language within a reasonable period. Such stipulations are intended to ensure functional efficiency and administrative convenience and do not, by themselves, elevate a “preferable” qualification to the status of a mandatory eligibility criterion at the threshold stage.

- iv. The reliance placed on the earlier notification dated 17.03.2018 by the writ petitioners also does not advance their case. The said notification pertained to a composite recruitment across multiple faculties and contained an express stipulation regarding consideration of candidates lacking Telugu knowledge. In contrast, the notification dated 17.08.2020 is faculty-specific and consciously omits such elaboration, which cannot be treated as inadvertent. It reflects a deliberate formulation by the recruiting authority, and it is not for the Court, in exercise of judicial review, to supply words or conditions that are not borne out from the text of the notification. Each recruitment notification must be interpreted on its own terms.
- v. Accepting the interpretation placed by the learned Single Judge would render the expression “is preferable” otiose and effectively substitute it with “is mandatory”, and would amount to rewriting the terms of the notification, which is impermissible.

**18.** It is pertinent to note that G.O.Ms.No.15 dated 29.06.2019, which governed the field, prescribes the methodology for evaluation of candidates under Table 3A. A perusal of the said G.O does not disclose any stipulation mandating publication of a merit list. The material placed on record indicates that a panel of selected candidates was duly prepared, wherein the private respondents were ranked first and the writ petitioners second. It is also not in dispute that the applicable Regulations require preparation of a panel comprising 50% more candidates than the notified vacancies, and the said requirement has been complied with. The mere non-publication of the merit list on the website, in the absence of any statutory requirement to that effect, cannot be construed as vitiating the selection process.

**19.** The further allegation that the selection was conducted in an opaque manner, or "in a dark room," and that the same is apparent on the record is wholly baseless and untenable. The notification itself made a specific reference to the "Criteria for shortlisting of candidates for interview for the post of Assistant Professors," which, in turn, was anchored in Table 3A of G.O.Ms.No.15. All candidates, including the writ petitioners, were required to submit self-assessment score cards in accordance with the said criteria. The writ petitioners admittedly complied with this requirement and participated in the selection process without demur. Having done so, it is not open to them to contend, at a later

stage, that the evaluation methodology was not disclosed or that the process lacked transparency.

**20.** In the present case, the writ petitioners applied pursuant to the notification dated 17.08.2020, submitted self-assessment score cards under Table 3A of G.O.Ms.No.15, and participated in the selection process with full knowledge of the evaluation criteria, including the allocation of marks for Ph.D., without raising any objection. Only after being unsuccessful they challenged the very criteria governing the selection. Respondent No.1's (writ petitioners) grievance regarding the award of 30 marks for Ph.D. is untenable, as Table 3A which governs allocations of marks forms part of G.O.Ms.No.15, the validity of which has not been questioned; in the absence of such challenge, the writ petitioners cannot assail its application after having participated in the process.

**21.** It is well settled that a candidate who participates in a selection process with full knowledge of the criteria governing such selection cannot, upon being unsuccessful, turn around and challenge the very same procedure. The said principle was considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Madan Lal v. State of J&K<sup>1</sup>**, wherein has held as under:

*9. Before dealing with this contention, we must keep in view the salient fact that the petitioners as well as the contesting successful candidates being respondents concerned herein, were all found eligible in the light of marks obtained in the written test, to be eligible to be called for oral interview. Up to this stage there is no dispute between the parties. The petitioners also appeared at the oral*

---

<sup>1</sup> (1995) 3 SCC 486

*interview conducted by the Members concerned of the Commission who interviewed the petitioners as well as the contesting respondents concerned. Thus the petitioners took a chance to get themselves selected at the said oral interview. Only because they did not find themselves to have emerged successful as a result of their combined performance both at written test and oral interview, they have filed this petition. It is now well settled that if a candidate takes a calculated chance and appears at the interview, then, only because the result of the interview is not palatable to him, he cannot turn round and subsequently contend that the process of interview was unfair or the Selection Committee was not properly constituted. In the case of Om Prakash Shukla v. Akhilesh Kumar Shukla [1986 Supp SCC 285 : 1986 SCC (L&S) 644 : AIR 1986 SC 1043] it has been clearly laid down by a Bench of three learned Judges of this Court that when the petitioner appeared at the examination without protest and when he found that he would not succeed in examination he filed a petition challenging the said examination, the High Court should not have granted any relief to such a petitioner.*

**22.** Further, the composition of the Selection Committee is also shown to be in conformity with Rule 2.1.1 of G.O.Ms.No.15, which envisages the Vice-Chancellor or his nominee as Chairperson, subject experts nominated by the Vice-Chancellor, the Dean of the Faculty, the Head of the Department, and an academican representing reserved categories. The bald assertion that the Committee was improperly constituted is not supported by any material on record, and there is neither any pleading nor proof to establish that the Committee lacked quorum or that any member suffered from disqualification.

**23.** It is to be noted that the allegation of *mala fides* levelled against the then Dean and Registrar is equally devoid of merit, as it rests on conjectures and surmises rather than substantiated facts. The assertion that the Dean had affiliations with institutions outside the State and that the Registrar hailed from a different

region does not, by itself, give rise to a legally sustainable inference of bias. The appellant-University has specifically clarified that the Dean was educated within the State, and insofar as the Registrar is concerned, his role in the Selection Committee is only administrative, without any determinative voting power. More importantly, the individuals against whom *mala fides* are alleged were not impleaded as parties, nor has any cogent material been placed on record to substantiate such allegations.

**24.** The direction given by the learned Single Judge to appoint the writ petitioners, who were second-ranked candidates, as Assistant Professors, while at the same time permitting the private respondents, who were first-ranked candidates, to continue in service is legally unsustainable on the facts and circumstances of the present case for the following reasons:

- i. This Court has already found that the selection process was conducted in accordance with the governing norms and that the private respondents were validly selected on merit as first-ranked candidates; in the absence of any illegality, there is no basis to direct appointment of additional or unsuccessful candidates, as the writ Court cannot grant such relief on mere equitable considerations.
- ii. Even assuming any irregularity, the settled course would be to set aside the selection and direct a fresh process, and not

to appoint second-ranked candidates, since such appointment does not automatically follow.

- iii. The direction to appoint the writ petitioners with notional seniority while permitting the private respondents to continue results in the impermissible situation of multiple incumbents against a single sanctioned post; such equitable considerations cannot justify judicial creation of posts, which lies exclusively within the executive domain.
- iv. The grant of notional seniority without actual service is untenable, as seniority ordinarily flows from the date of entry into service, and no exceptional circumstances have been shown to warrant such a deviation.

**25.** In view of the findings recorded hereinabove, namely, that the selection process was conducted in accordance with the governing norms; that the requirement of Telugu language was merely "preferable" and not mandatory; that the writ petitioners are estopped from challenging the selection after having participated in it, and that the direction to appoint the writ petitioners is legally unsustainable, this Court is of the considered opinion that the impugned common order of the learned Single Judge is liable to be set aside to the extent it directs such appointment. Insofar as the private respondents are concerned, their selection and appointment having been found valid and free from infirmity, their continuance does not warrant any

interference, particularly having regard to the fact that they have been serving since 2021, have in the meantime passed the Telugu language test conducted by TSPSC in 2023.

### **Conclusion**

**26.** For the foregoing reasons, the W.A.Nos.284 and 285 of 2026 are allowed. The common order dated 02.12.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.Nos.13507 of 2021 and 13420 of 2021 is set aside to the extent it directs the appellant-University to appoint the writ petitioners as Assistant Professors.

Consequently, miscellaneous petitions pending if any shall stand closed. No costs.

//TRUE COPY//

**SD/-K.SRINIVASA RAO  
JOINT REGISTRAR**

6

**SECTION OFFICER**

**To,**

1. The Principal Secretary to Government Animal Husbandry, Dairy and Fisheries, Secretariat, Telangana State, Hyderabad
2. Two CCs to GP for Animal Husbandry, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad. [OUT]
3. One CC to Dr.K.SHANKARA NARAYANA, Advocate. [OPUC]
4. One CC to SRI RAMESH BABU VISHWANATHULA, Advocate. [OPUC]
5. Two CD Copies.

BSK/PMK



**HIGH COURT**

**DATED: 21/04/2026**

**JUDGMENT**

**WA.Nos.284 AND 285 OF 2026**

**ALLOWING THE WRIT PETITIONS  
WITHOUT COSTS**



⑧ ③  
28/4/26