



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

Bench
Sr.No:-10
[3483]

WP(PIL) NO: 63 of 2023

K. Damodhara Rao

...Petitioner

Vs.

Union of India and others

...Respondents

Advocate for Petitioner:

Mr. J. Sudheer

Advocate(s) for Respondent(s):

Mr. Challa Dhananjai (Additional
Solicitor General)
GP for Finance & Planning
GP for Women Dev & Child Welfare
GP for General Administration
Mr. K. Raghu Veer

**CORAM : THE CHIEF JUSTICE DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR
SRI JUSTICE RAVI CHEEMALAPATI**

DATE : 08th October, 2025.

P C:

This is a petition filed purportedly in public interest seeking a direction for initiation of disciplinary proceedings against respondent No.6, who was working as Secretary to Government, Women, Child, Differently Abled and Senior Citizens Department, Andhra Pradesh.

2. It is alleged that respondent No.6 had appointed an employee on contract basis without following due procedure prescribed in Government Order bearing G.O.Ms.No.94, GAD, dated 28.03.2003, consequent where to

salary was disbursed to the said contract employee without due concurrence from the Finance Department.

3. In the response filed by respondent No.5/Principal Secretary to Government, the stand taken is that one Sri J. Purna Chandra Rao was appointed as Personal Assistant to Secretary to Government, Women, Child, Differently Abled and Senior Citizens Department, with a remuneration of Rs.22,000/- per month with the concurrence of the Finance Department, after satisfying the minimum qualification of graduation from Rashtriya Vishwa Vidyapeeth, Mumbai and Diploma in Software Technology from National Institute of Computer Education.

4. It is stated that a complaint however came to be filed regarding appointment of Sri J. Purna Chandra Rao, alleging that the qualification certificates were invalid. Based upon the complaint, the appointment of Sri J. Purna Chandra Rao was kept in abeyance *vide* Government Order bearing G.O.Rt.NO.64, Dept. for WCDA&SC(OP), dated 27.03.2018.

5. It appears that a clarification was sought from the Education Department, Government of Maharashtra regarding the educational qualifications of Sri J. Purna Chandra Rao as to whether the said institute was recognized by the University Grants Commission or not. It is stated that the information provided by the Government of Maharashtra was that the Rashtriya Vishwa Vidyapeet, Mumbai was a private institute and had no

recognition of any statutory body and that it was a self financed institution which did not come under University Grants Commission, All India Council for Technical Education or Distance Education Bureau.

6. The stand further taken is that Sri J. Purna Chandra Rao has also reimbursed the amount of Rs.1,21,719/- which was received by him as honorarium for the period from 19.07.2017 to December, 2017. It is further stated that the appointment of Sri J. Purna Chandra Rao was finally cancelled *vide* G.O.Rt.No.88, Department for Women, Children, Differently abled and Senior Citizens, dated 06.06.2019.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. J. Sudheer, would submit that since the appointment made was not only irregular but also illegal, coupled with the fact that the order of appointment had incorrectly stated that the order was being issued with the concurrence of the Finance Department, the officer concerned/respondent No. 6 ought to be proceeded against for the said illegality.

8. We, however, are of the opinion that the present W.P.(PIL) has been filed with a view to somehow seek action against respondent No.6 only, which is the entire basis of the present petition, which petition if allowed, would not in any case, serve the larger public interest, notwithstanding the fact that the present petition has been styled as PIL. In this regard, it would be apt to refer

to the observation made by the Apex Court in **Neetu v. State of Punjab**¹, where the Apex Court held as under:

“7. When a particular person is the object and target of a petition styled as PIL, the court has to be careful to see whether the attack in the guise of public interest is really intended to unleash a private vendetta, personal grouse or some other mala fide object.”

9. In our opinion, since action has already been taken in ordering the cancellation of the appointment made in favour of Sri J. Purna Chandra Rao, no further directions are warranted in the facts and circumstances of the case.

10. The present Writ Petition (PIL) is accordingly closed. No costs. Consequently, pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand closed.

DHIRAJ SINGH THAKUR, CJ.

RAVI CHEEMALAPATI, J.

SSN

¹ (2007) 10 SCC 614