vw.ecourtsindia.com

HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH: AMARAVATI

MAIN CASE: W.A.No.277 of 2021

PROCEEDINGS SHEET

SI. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
	07.05.2024		
1	07.05.2021	(Taken up through video conferencing)	
		<u>I.A.No.1 of 2021</u>	
		This is an application to dispense with the	
		requirement of filing certified copy of the order under	
		challenge in this writ appeal.	
		Prayer is allowed.	
		I.A.No.1 of 2021 stands disposed of.	
		<u>I.A.No.2 of 2021</u>	
		Heard Mr. Srinivasa Rao Bodduluri, learned counsel	
		for the appellants.	
		Also heard the learned Government Pleader for	
		Education for respondent No.2, Mr. N.A. Ramachandra	
		Murthy, learned counsel appearing for respondent No.4,	
		and Mr. Ponnavolu Sudhakara Reddy, learned Additional	
		Advocate General representing Mr. Koppineedi Rambabu,	
		learned standing counsel for respondent No.5.	
		This is an application seeking leave to prefer appeal	
		against the common order dated 05.03.2021 passed in	
		W.P.No.23770 of 2017 and batch. This appeal is	
		preferred in connection with W.P.No.22226 of 2018. The plea of the appellants is that they were not	
		made parties to the writ proceedings and yet, their	
		appointment orders came to be interfered with.	
		W.A.No.214 of 2021 had also arisen against the	
		said common order dated 05.03.2021 in respect of	
		W.P.No.10813 of 2018. As the appellants therein were	
		also third parties to the proceedings, an application, being	
		I.A.No.2 of 2021, seeking leave to appeal was filed. In the	
		said application, while granting leave, this Court had	
		passed the following order on 08.04.2021:	
		"This is an application seeking leave to	
		prefer appeal.	

OFFICE SI. DATE ORDER NOTE No. Heard Mr. Motupalli Vijaya Kumar, learned counsel for the applicants/appellants. Also heard Mr. P. B. Vijaya Kumar, learned counsel for respondents 1 to 8, learned Government Pleader for Higher Education for respondent No.9, Mr. P. Venugopal, learned counsel for respondents 10, 11 and Mr. Addanki Ramachandra Murthy, learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.12. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the applicants/appellants that the learned single Judge had posed a question, namely, whether the reservations provided for deprived sections of the society and women, are applicable to the posts of Professors also and then recorded a finding that there will be no reservation for deprived sections of the society for the posts of Professors. He submits that though the appointments of applicants/appellants, who were appointed as Professors, are not challenged in the Writ Petition, such appointments came to be interfered with. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, we deem it appropriate to grant leave to prefer appeal. Leave is, accordingly, granted. I.A. stands disposed of. Registry will list this appeal for admission, on 15.04.2021" Mr. Srinivasa Rao Bodduluri, learned counsel for the appellants, draws the attention of the Court to an order dated 17.12.2018 passed in I.A.No.2 of 2018 in W.P.No.20227 of 2018, wherein it was recorded that for the post of Professor, there is no reservation at all. It is also pointed out by him that in the common order under

SI.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
No.		challenge, the learned single Judge had noted that	
		reservation is provided for only to the posts of Assistant	
		Professors and Associate Professors. He submits that in	
		the appointment orders, it was indicated that the	
		appointments are subject to the decision/direction by any	
		court of law. He further submits that there was no Court	
		order indicating that appointment of the	
		applicants/appellants would be subject to the result of the	
		writ petition.	
		Having heard the learned counsel for the parties,	
		we deem it appropriate to grant leave to prefer appeal.	
		Accordingly, leave is granted.	
		I.A.No.2 of 2021 stands disposed of.	
		W.A.No.277 of 2021	
		In view of granting leave to appeal, this appeal is	
		admitted.	
		No formal steps are required so far as respondent	
		Nos.2, 4 and 5 are concerned, as they are duly	
		represented.	
		Steps for service of notice upon respondent No.1	
		by registered post with acknowledgement due.	
		Notice to respondent No.3 may be served upon	
		Mr. P.S.P. Suresh Kumar, learned counsel, as he is stated	
		to be the standing counsel.	
		List this appeal along with W.A.No.214 of 2021.	
		<u>I.A.No.3 of 2021</u>	
		This is an application praying for grant of interim	
		stay of operation of the order dated 19.04.2021 issued by	
		the 5 th respondent-University.	
		Mr. Srinivasa Rao Bodduluri, learned counsel for	
		the appellants, submits that in I.A.No.3 of 2021 in	
		W.A.No.214 of 2021, by an order passed on 22.04.2021,	
		this Court had suspended the order dated 05.03.2021 so	
		far as it related to the appellants in the said appeal and	
		that apart, the e-mails stated to have been issued	
		cancelling the appointment of the appellants therein were	

SI.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE
No.	DAIE	UKDEK	NOTE
		also directed not to be given effect to and the appellants	
		therein were allowed to continue in service until further	
		orders. It is submitted that on 19.04.2021, the Registrar	
		of respondent No.5-University had also issued orders	
		cancelling the appointment of the appellants.	
		On due consideration, we suspend the order dated	
		05.03.2021 in W.P.No.22226 of 2018 and batch so far as	
		it relates to the appellants herein. The order dated	
		19.04.2021 stated to have been issued by the Registrar of	
		respondent No.5-University, cancelling the appointment of	
		the appellants, shall not be given effect to and the	
		appellants shall be allowed to continue in service until	
		further orders.	
		ARUP KUMAR GOSWAMI, CJ C. PRAVEEN KUMAR, J	
		MRR/IBL/Nn	

SI. No.	DATE	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE