

HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA

MAIN CASE No: W.A.Nos.1066, 1067, 1068, 1069, 1070, 1071, 1072, 1073, 1074, 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1080 and 1054 of 2025

PROCEEDING SHEET

Sl. No.	Date	ORDER	OFFICE NOTE
1.	24.09.2025	<p><u>HCJ (AKrS,J) & GMM,J</u></p> <p>Mr. A.Sudarshan Reddy, learned Advocate General and Mr. P.S.Rajasekhar, learned Standing Counsel appear for the Telangana Public Service Commission.</p> <p>Mr. D.Prakash Reddy, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Sriram Polali, learned counsel for respondent Nos.60, 61, 63, 64, 67 to 71, 74 to 79, 81, 82, 84, 86 to 125, 127 to 133, 135 to 137, 140 to 158 and 160 to 164 in W.A.No.1066 of 2025.</p> <p>Ms. B.Rachna Reddy, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Mohd. Baseer Riyaz, learned counsel for the respondents /writ petitioners in W.A.No.1066 of 2025.</p> <p>Mr. A.Venkatesh, learned Senior Counsel representing Ms. Dornala Sai Mahitha, learned counsel for respondent No.1 in W.A.No.1070 of 2025.</p> <p>Mr. K.S.Murthy, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. S.Rama Mohan</p>	

	<p>Rao, learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 to 4 in W.A.No.1076 of 2025.</p> <p>Mr. G.Vidya Sagar, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Sai Prasen Gundavaram, learned counsel for the respondents/writ petitioners in W.A.No. 1077 of 2025.</p> <p>Mr. M.Surender Rao, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Srinivasa Rao Madiraju, learned counsel for the unofficial respondents/writ petitioners in W.A.No. 1079 of 2025.</p> <p>Dr. S.Muralidhar, learned Senior Counsel representing Mr. Aditya Vyas, learned counsel for the successful candidates.</p> <p>Dr. K.Lakshmi Narasimha, learned counsel for the appellant in W.A.No.1054 of 2025.</p> <p>Mr. Gummalla Bhasker Reddy, learned counsel for respondent Nos.3 to 7 in W.A.No.1054 and respondent Nos.1 to 5 in W.A.No.1074 of 2025.</p> <p>Mr. P.Vishnu Vardhana Reddy, learned Senior Counsel for respondent Nos.83, 159 and 134 in W.A.No.1066 of 2025.</p> <p>Mr. Shreyas Reddy Yalagiri, learned counsel for respondent No.1 in W.A.No.1069</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>of 2025.</p> <p>Mr. Poodattu Amarender, learned counsel for the appellants in W.A.No.1080 of 2025 and respondent Nos.23 to 39 in W.A.No.1066 of 2025.</p> <p>All these appeals assail the order dated 09.09.2025 rendered by the learned writ Court in a batch of writ petitions led by W.P.No.11439 of 2025. The appellant is the Telangana Public Service Commission and the successful candidates who are aggrieved by the impugned order whereby the Final Marks List dated 10.03.2025 and General Ranking List dated 30.03.2025 for Group-I examination conducted by the Public Service Commission under advertisement dated 19.02.2024 was set aside. The learned writ Court has, after setting aside the Final Marks List and General Ranking List, issued alternative directions either to re-evaluate the answer sheets of the Group-I examination by applying the moderation method in terms of Sanjay Singh v. U.P.Public Service Commission, Allahabad [(2007) 3 SCC 720] manually and announce the results or to cancel the Group-I Mains Examination and re-conduct it under the said notification dated 19.02.2024 for those who have succeeded in the prelims</p>	
--	---	--

examination.

Learned counsel for the appellant have contended that the learned writ Court has committed serious error in holding that the examination suffered from transparency and integrity as the Commission deviated from its own Rules and acted in a biased manner. It is submitted that there is no allegation or proof of any leakage of question paper or answer sheets or mass irregularity in the conduct of the examination. It is further submitted that the Commission had duly observed the procedure for conduct of the said examination as per Rules. The instant examination was conducted for the first time after creation of the State of Telangana. The impugned order has cast serious stigma on a constitutional body like the Public Service Commission which is empowered to conduct such examinations for recruitment to the Group-I category and other services in the State. Learned counsel for the appellants have prayed for stay of the impugned order.

Learned counsel for the writ petitioners have argued in support of the order rendered by the learned writ Court. It is submitted that the whole examination process suffered from procedural irregularities. The evaluation of the answer

	<p>sheets also were undertaken without any backing of Rules. It is submitted that the learned writ Court examined each of the contentions raised by the writ petitioners and has given considered findings. Therefore, the learned writ Court was persuaded to set aside the Final Marks List and General Ranking List and direct re-evaluation of the answer sheets of Group-I examination by applying the moderation method. The learned writ Court had also issued alternative direction that if such re-evaluation is not possible, the Commission shall re-conduct the Group-I examination for those who have succeeded in the prelims examination. It is submitted that the writ petitioners shall adequately demonstrate that the impugned order does not suffer from any infirmity or errors which warrant interference by this Court in appeal.</p> <p>Learned counsel for both the sides agree that the matter may be heard on any date as is convenient to the Court.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the appellant as well as the respondents/writ petitioners undertake to make their submissions on the basis of the pleadings contained in the lead matter i.e., the documents on record in W.A.No.1066 of 2025.</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>Learned counsel for the appellant Commission and the successful candidates undertake to provide written submissions for convenience of the Court latest by 10.10.2025.</p> <p>Learned counsel for the writ petitioners/unofficial respondents also submit that three set of written submissions would be submitted each by them covering the case of the writ petitioners.</p> <p>As prayed for, list these cases on 15.10.2025.</p> <p>In the meantime, there shall be interim suspension of the operative direction contained in paragraph No.372 of the impugned order. Any appointments made in the meantime shall be subject to the outcome of the instant writ appeals.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">HCJ (AKrS,J)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">GMM,J</p> <p>KL</p>	
--	--	---	--