



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3328]

FRIDAY, THE FOURTH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA
PRASAD**

WRIT PETITION NO: 5316 OF 2025

Between:

1. JAMMULA NANDASAI MITHRA, D/O. JAMMULA RAMAKRISHNA
RAO, AGED ABOUT 22 YEARS, OCC MEDICO, R/O. D.NO. 142 B,
SECTOR 3, UKKUNAGARAM, PEDAGANTYADA, VISAKHAPATNAM,
ANDHRA PRADESH-530032

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF AP, REP. BY ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY, HEALTH,
MEDICAL AND FAMILY WELFARE DEPARTMENT, SECRETARIAT
BUILDINGS, AMARAVATI, GUNTUR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
2. DR NTR UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES, REP. BY ITS
REGISTRAR, VIJAYAWADA, ANDHRA PRADESH-520008.
3. THE JOINT REGISTRAR, EXAMINATIONS, DR. NTR UNIVERSITY OF
HEALTH SCIENCES, NTR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
4. THE CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATION, DR. NTR UNIVERSITY OF
HEALTH SCIENCES, NTR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
5. THE DY REGISTRAR, DR. NTR UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH
SCIENCES, NTR DISTRICT, ANDHRA PRADESH.
6. THE PRINCIPAL, ANDHRA MEDICAL COLLEGE, VISAKHAPATNAM,
ANDHRA PRADESH.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Counsel for the Petitioner:

MS. KOTA KRISHNA DEEPTHI, LD. COUNSEL APPEARED ON BEHALF OF Mr. JADA SRAVAN KUMAR.

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

- 1.GP FOR MEDICAL HEALTH FW
- 2.Smt. Tata Venkata Sridevi, Standing Counsel For Dr.NTR University of Health Sciences

The Court made the following:

Heard Ms. Kota Krishna Deepthi, learned Counsel appearing for the Writ Petitioner; Smt. T.V. Sri Devi, learned Standing Counsel for Dr. NTR University of Health Sciences and Sri P. Soma Raju, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Medical & Health.

2. The present Writ Petition is filed seeking the following prayer:

“.....to issue a Writ Order or direction particularly, one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondent no.3 in issuing the impugned Memo No.1102/EIC/MBBS/2024 dated 16-01-2025, rejecting the claim of the petitioner for the grant of additional compensatory time for all MBBS Second Year examinations and the continuation of the same for all upcoming examinations until the completion of MBBS course, in view of her benchmark disability of ‘Cerebral Palsy’ depriving the petitioner the reasonable accommodation contrary to the Guidelines issued regarding the admission and examination process for students with “Specified Disabilities” under the Right of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, specifically designed to ensure an equitable learning environment as per Section 2(y) of the Right of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and the judgment of the Honble Apex Court in Vikash Kumar Vs. Union Public Service Commission and Ors, MANU/SC/0067/2021, besides being contrary to the “Guidelines for conducting written examination for persons with benchmark disabilities” issued by the Ministry of Social justice and Empowerment (Department of Empowerment of persons with Disabilities (Divyanggan) vide Office Memorandum Dated 29.08.2018 as illegal, unjust, unfair, arbitrary, and in violation of the Fundamental Rights of the petitioner guaranteed under Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution of India besides being in violation of the provisions enshrined in the Right of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and consequently set aside the impugned Memo No.1102/EIC/MBBS/2024 dated 16-01-2025 issued by the respondent no.3 duly directing the respondents to permit the petitioner to attend the II year MBBBS examinations and all other upcoming examinations till the completion of the course with a grant of additional compensatory time of 30 minutes in accordance with “Guidelines for conducting written

examination for persons with benchmark disabilities” issued by the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment (Department of Empowerment of persons with Disabilities (Divyangan) vide Office Memorandum Dated 29.08.2018. As per Section 2(y) of the Right of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and the judgment of the Honble Apex Court in Vikash Kumar Vs. Union Public Service Commission and Ors, MANU/SC/0067/2021 and pass such other order or orders may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case”.

3. On 04.03.2025, when this Writ Petition was listed for the first time, two weeks time was granted to the Respondent Authorities to file the Counter Affidavit. In compliance of the same, the Counter Affidavit has been filed by the Dr. N.T.R. University of Health Sciences (Respondent No.2) on 12.03.2025.

4. Ms. Kota Krishna Deepthi, learned Counsel appearing for the Writ Petitioner has submitted the following facts:

4.1. It is submitted that the Writ Petitioner has joined the MBBS Course in Andhra Medical College, Visakhapatnam for the academic batch 2020-2021. The Writ Petitioner is suffering from the disability of ‘Cerebral Palsy’. The ‘*Certificate for Person with Disability*’ was issued to the Writ Petitioner (Ex.P.12) to the effect that the Writ Petitioner suffers from physical (Locomotor/Orthopaedic) disability affecting the Bilateral Lower Limbs. It is submitted that this disability severely impacts the ability to complete written examinations within the stipulated duration under Section 2(r) of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (for short ‘RPwD Act, 2016’).

4.2. It is submitted that the disability of the Writ Petitioner, having been classified as a ‘Benchmark Disability’ under RPwD Act, 2016, makes the Writ Petitioner eligible for special accommodation in examinations. Having recognised the disability, the Writ Petitioner was given 60 minutes in addition to the regular duration of time fixed for examinations i.e., three hours. In other words, the Writ Petitioner was allowed to write the examination within the period of four hours instead of three hours due to her ‘Benchmark Disability’ of ‘Cerebral Palsy’. When the Writ Petitioner tried to write the answer script

within four hours of duration, she could not succeed because of the fact that she was unable to complete even by utilizing extra one hour time granted to her. As it became difficult to the Writ Petitioner to sail through the first year MBBS examinations, the Writ Petitioner has approached this Court by filing W.P.No.8781 of 2023. A Learned Single Judge, *vide* Order dated 29.02.2024, was pleased to grant additional time of 30 minutes in addition to one extra hour that is already granted as statutory entitlement of the Writ Petitioner under the RPwD Act, 2016.

4.3. It is submitted that this Order of Learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.No.8781 of 2023 dated 29.02.2024, had helped the Writ Petitioner in utilizing the extra time, thereby making it possible to the Writ Petitioner to clear the first year MBBS examinations. The operative portion of the Order of the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.8781 of 2023 dated 29.02.2024 is usefully extracted hereunder:

“12. In view of the same, taking into consideration the fact that the 5th attempt is going to be the last attempt of the petitioner and treating the case of the petitioner as a special case, on sympathetic and humanitarian grounds, this Court feel it appropriate to direct the respondents to provide 30 minutes additional time to the petitioner, in addition to the 60 minutes time which was already granted as per University letter dated 27.12.2021. However, it is made clear that the concession given to the petitioner would apply only to the petitioner in view of the circumstances as explained above and only to the present academic year and the same cannot be treated as precedent.”

4.4. It is submitted that having been successful in first year MBBS examinations, the Writ Petitioner has pursued second year MBBS course also. In view of limited Order of the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.8781 of 2023 dated 29.02.2024, the Respondent No.2 had declined to extend the similar benefit for the second year MBBS examinations, which are scheduled to commence from 07.04.2025 and also for the subsequent years of MBBS Course. To this effect, the Respondent No.2 had issued a Memo dated 16.01.2025 (Ex.P.1) stating that the benefit of extra 30 minutes that was given to the Writ Petitioner during the first year MBBS examinations was by virtue of

the Order passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.8781 of 2023 dated 29.02.2024 and it was limited to the first year MBBS examinations only, since it has been categorically held in the said Order that the said extra 30 minutes compensatory time granted to the Writ Petitioner shall not form a precedent

5. The Counter Affidavit filed by the Respondent No.2 had stoutly opposed the prayer of the Writ Petitioner. Learned Counsel for the Respondent No.2 has taken this Court through the contents of the Counter Affidavit. In the Counter Affidavit, the Respondent No.2 has traced the various guidelines issued from time to time. The Respondent No.2 has referred to the guidelines issued, vide Office Memorandum dated 29.08.2018. The Guidelines issued by the National Medical Commission, New Delhi for Competency Based Medical Education Curriculum (CBME) Regulations, 2023, came into effect from 01.08.2023. As per the revised Regulations, the pass criteria for passing of the MBBS examinations is reduced from 50% to 40%.

5.1. Learned Counsel for the Respondent No.2 has submitted that the Order passed by the Learned Single Judge in W.P.No.8781 of 2023 dated 29.02.2024 would only be confined to the first year MBBS examinations, since the Learned Single Judge has clearly stated that the concession given to the Writ Petitioner would apply only to the Writ Petitioner in view of the circumstances explained in the Writ Petition and only to the first year MBBS examinations and cannot be treated as precedent.

5.2. Ld. Counsel appearing for the Respondent No.2 would submit that based on the description of the disability as mentioned in the 'Certificate for Person with Disability' submitted by the Writ Petitioner dated 30.08.2019 (Ex.P.12), it cannot be said that the Writ Petitioner herein suffers from any Locomotor Disability in the upper part of the body. Ld. Counsel has drawn the attention of this Court to the description of the disability of the Writ Petitioner indicating that the disability is of the nature of physical disability (Locomotor/ Orthopedic); that the disability is in relation to her Bilateral Lower Limb and

Impaired Reach. The sub-type of disability is described as Cerebral Palsy (CP) and the cause of disability is recorded as 'Birth Injury'. The Certificate also states that the re-assessment of this case is not recommended. The percentage of disability in the case of the Writ Petitioner is 60% and the Writ Petitioner meets the following physical requirements for discharge of her duties which are as follows: "F – can perform work by manipulating fingers; L – can perform work by lifting; B – can perform work by bending; S – can perform work by sitting; ST – can perform work by standing.

5.3. This Medical Assessment has been done by three doctors belonging to the Departments of Orthopedics, Department of Ophthalmology and Department of Dermatology (Ex.P.12). On query made by this Court, as to what 'DDDL' stands for, it was informed by the Ld. Counsel for Respondent No.2 that 'DDDL' qualification does not exist and the only course existing is Diploma in Dermatology, Venereology and Leprosy (DDVL). It therefore appears that it has been wrongly typed as 'DDDL', instead of 'DDVL' in so far as the additional qualification of Dr. Jagan Mohan Rao is concerned.

6. Ms. Kota Krishna Deepthi, learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner has taken this court through the various Judgments and would submit that the RPwD Act, 2016 is a beneficial piece of Social Legislation, particularly intended to enable the disabled persons to come into the main stream. She has also drawn the attention of this Court to Section 2(y) of the RPwD Act, 2016 and would submit that a "reasonable accommodation" should be afforded to the person like the Writ Petitioner. She would submit that the definition of "reasonable accommodation" under Section 2(y) of the RPwD Act, 2016, means 'necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments, without imposing a disproportionate or undue burden in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise of rights equally with others'.

6.1. Learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner has also drawn the attention of this Court to the Judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in **Sunanda**

Bhandare Foundation Vs. Union of India : (2018) 2 SCC 397. It is laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court that "the approach and attitude of the executive must be liberal and relief oriented and not obstructive or lethargic in the matters of providing relief to those who are differently abled."

6.2. Learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner has also drawn the attention of this Court to the dictum of Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Vikash Kumar Vs. UPPC and Ors. : 2021 (5) SCC 370.*** Wherein, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that "failure to meet the individual needs of every disabled person will breach the norm of reasonable accommodation. Flexibility in answering individual needs and requirements is essential to reasonable accommodation (Para-48 of Vikash Kumar's case)."

6.3. Learned Counsel for the Writ Petitioner has also drawn the attention of this Court to the Judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Syed Bashir-uddin Qadri Vs. Nazir Ahmed Shah : (2010) 3 SCC 603,*** wherein, the Hon'ble Apex Court had taken judicial note of the persons suffering from 'Cerebral Palsy'.

6.4. In ***Vikash Kumar Vs. UPPC and Ors. : 2021 (5) SCC 370,*** the Hon'ble Apex Court held in Para Nos.56 & 76 as under:

"56. It gives a powerful voice to the disabled people who, by dint of the way their impairment interacts with society, hitherto felt muted and silenced. The Act tells them that they belong, that they matter, that they are assets, not liabilities and that they make us stronger, not weaker. The other provisions of Chapter II follow upon the basic postulates embodied in Section 3 by applying them in specific contexts to ensure rights in various milieus such as community life, reproduction, access to justice and guardianship. Chapter III of the 2016 RPwD Act recognises specific duties on the part of educational institutions. Section 17 speaks of specific measures to promote and facilitate inclusive education. Among them, Clause (g) contemplates the provision of books, learning materials and assistive devices for students with benchmark disabilities free of cost up to the age of eighteen. Section 17(i) requires suitable modifications in the curriculum and examination system to meet the needs of students with disabilities such as : (i) extra time for completion of examination (ii) the facility of scribe or amanuensis (iii) exemption from second and third language courses. The guarantee under Section 17(i) is not confined to persons with benchmark disabilities but extends to students with disabilities. It is thus evident that the legislature has made a clear distinction between disability and benchmark disability. Section 20

provides a mandate of non-discrimination in employment. Under Section 21, every establishment is under a mandate to notify equal opportunity policies setting out the measures which will be adopted in pursuance of the provisions of Chapter IV. Chapter V provides guarantees for social security, health, rehabilitation and recreation to persons with disabilities.

76. The ASG referred to the difficulty caused to her by dint of having carpal tunnel syndrome as an example of the dangerous consequences that would flow from opening the door too widely when it comes to granting scribes. In the hearing, examples were also cited of individuals having a small, everyday problem and expecting a scribe on that basis. While valid, such comparisons may end up creating a false equivalence between those with a legitimate disability-based reasonable accommodation need and others with everyday “life problems”. Therefore, it has to be ensured that we do not make light of, or trivialise, the needs of those whose disability may not meet the quantitative threshold of 40% but are nonetheless disabling enough to merit the grant of the reasonable accommodation of a scribe and extra time. As the CRPD Committee notes, it is wrong to expect a person with disability to be “disabled enough” to claim the accommodations necessitated by their disability. Such an approach would not be in consonance with the progressive outlook of the 2016 RPwD Act.”

6.5. The Hon’ble Apex Court had dealt with the scope of ‘reasonable accommodation’ and the provision of a scribe and extra time to be granted to the differently abled persons suffering from benchmark disabilities.

7. In ***Avni Prakash Vs. National Testing Agency (NTA) and Ors., : (2023) 2 SCC 286***. The Hon’ble Apex Court held in Para Nos.40 & 41 as under:

“40. Education plays a key role in social and economic inclusion and effective participation in society. Inclusive education is indispensable for ensuring universal and non-discriminatory access to education. The Convention on Rights of Persons with Disabilities recognises that inclusive education systems must be put in place for a meaningful realisation of the right to education for PwD. Thus, a right to education is essentially a right to inclusive education. In India, the RPwD Act, 2016 provides statutory backing to the principle of inclusive education. Section 2(m) defines “inclusive education” as:

“2. (m) “inclusive education” means a system of education wherein students with and without disability learn together and the system of teaching and learning is suitably adapted to meet the learning needs of different types of students with disabilities;”

41. The RPwD Act, 2016 contains salutary provisions on the rights of PwD to inclusive education in Chapter III. Section 17, which forms a part of Chapter III, entails specific measures to promote and facilitate inclusive education for students with disabilities. Among other inclusive measures in Section 17, is sub-section (i) which prescribes a duty to make suitable modifications in the curriculum and examination system to meet the needs of students with disabilities. This duty can be fulfilled by providing extra time for the completion of examination papers and/or the facility of a scribe. The provision of inclusive education is not limited to children with disabilities but extends to adults with disabilities. Section 18 provides that the Government and local authorities are duty-bound to take measures to promote, protect and ensure participation of PwD in adult education and continuing education programmes on an equal footing with others. Chapter VI prescribes special provisions for persons with benchmark disabilities, including reservations in higher educational institutions of not less than 5% seats under Section 32.”

8. In Gulshan Kumar Vs. Institute of Banking Personnel Selection and Others : 2025 SCC OnLine 223. The Hon’ble Apex Court has once again reiterated that it is trait that the Society should recognise the special requirements of differently abled persons through a differential approach.

9. The facts narrated hereinabove would clearly indicate that, initially compensatory time of extra one hour in an examination of three hours that was granted by the Respondent No.2, was found inadequate for the Writ Petitioner. This is reflected from the fact that the Writ Petitioner could not succeed in passing through the first year MBBS examinations on earlier occasions when only 4 hours was provided, whereas the Writ Petitioner had succeeded in the first year MBBS examinations after availing the benefit of the Order of the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.8781 of 2023 dated 29.02.2024 by which, she was given 4½ hours. As on the date that the learned Single Judge has granted extra time, the beneficial outcome of such an Order was yet to be known. The success of the Writ Petitioner in the first year MBBS examinations after availing the compensatory time of 30 minutes made it evident that the extra 30 minutes was the one that made all the differences for the Writ Petitioner to succeed in the first year MBBS examinations. Although, it was stated by the learned Single Judge that it was not a binding precedent,

the case of the Writ Petitioner is required to be assessed and evaluated based on the success in the first year MBBS examinations after availing the extra time.

10. Having regard to the interpretation given by the Hon'ble Apex Court in respect of the socially beneficial laws governing the differently abled persons, this Court does not find any reason to reject the request made by the Writ Petitioner inasmuch as the Writ Petitioner was able to utilise the extra time that was given by this Court on the earlier occasion and pass the 1st year MBBS Examinations.

11. The Office Memorandum issued by the Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment contained the Guidelines. The Guideline No.12, which was already considered by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.8781 of 2023 dated 29.02.2024 becomes the most relevant provision, inasmuch as the minimum time is only prescribed in the said Guideline, whereas the maximum time is consciously not prescribed in the said Guideline. To that extent, learned Single Judge of this Court in W.P.No.8781 of 2023 dated 29.02.2024 in Para No.10 has held as under:

“10. At this juncture, this court feels it appropriate to extract clause XII of the guidelines issued by the Department of Empowerment of persons with Disabilities (Divyanggan) vide Office Memorandum dated 29.08.2018, which reads as under:-

“XII. The word “extra time or additional time” that is being currently used should be changed to “compensatory time” and the same should not be less than 20 minutes per hour of examination for persons who are allowed use of scribe/reader/lab assistant. All the candidates with benchmark disability not availing the facility of scribe may be allowed additional time of minimum of one hour for examination of 3 hours duration. In case the duration of the examination is less than an hour, then the duration of additional time should be allowed on pro-rata basis. Additional time should not be less than 5 minutes and should be in the multiple of 5.”

12. Insofar as the submission of the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent is concerned, that the Writ Petitioner suffers the disability only with regard to the Bilateral Lower Limb and impaired reach and therefore, there is no disability with regard to the upper part of the body, this Court has examined the 'Certificate for Person with Disability' (Ex.P.12), issued by the Government of Andhra Pradesh. The said Certificate was issued by a medical board with three doctors. One Member (Dr. M. Jagan Mohan Rao, MBBS, DDDL- Department of Dermatology) is shown as chairman of the Medical Board; the second Member is Dr. D.S.Naidu, M.S. (Orthopedics), Asst. Professor and the third Member is one Dr. J. Narasinga Rao, MBBS, Diploma in Ophthalmology, Asst. Professor.

13. As indicated earlier, when this Court had enquired as what constitutes 'DDDL' which is shown as additional qualification of Dr. M. Jagan Mohan Rao, it was informed by the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No.2 that there is no such qualification as "DDDL". She would also submit that insofar as the description of the additional qualification of Dr. M. Jagan Mohan Rao is concerned, it has to be "DDVL" (Diploma in Dermatology, Venereology and Leprosy).

14. Having noticed the constitution of the above Board, it is evident that the Medical Board constituted for examining a person suffering from the disability of the 'Cerebral Palsy' is defective inasmuch as atleast one Member of the Board ought to have been from the Department of Neurology. In any case, doctors from the Departments of Ophthalmology and Dermatology are certainly not competent to evaluate the nature of disability of a person affected by 'Cerebral Palsy'.

15. Therefore, this Court is unable to countenance as to how the Doctors with Diploma in Ophthalmology, Diploma in Dermatology, Venereology and Leprosy and M.S. (Orthopedics) could have assessed the neurology disorder, if any, of the Writ Petitioner. Therefore, the submission of the Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No.2 that the Writ Petitioner does not

suffer from any disability insofar as the upper body is concerned, as assessed by the Medical Board (consisting of one Dermatologist and one Ophthalmologist out of the three experts) cannot be accepted.

16. The 'birth injury' leading to 'Cerebral Palsy', to the 'elementary knowledge' of this Court, would occur on account of the Neurological system being affected. Although this Court, does not have the expertise to state as to how the Writ Petitioner is neurologically affected, suffice it to state that the Medical Board constituted by the Government of Andhra Pradesh to examine a person with disability of 'Cerebral Palsy' is certainly irregular and improper which goes to the very root of the matter and therefore is defective.

17. In any case, this Court, having analysed various Judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the aforesaid Paragraphs, is of the view that the reasonable approximations should be made so as to give benefit to an individual suffering with any kind of benchmark disability rather than looking for any precision with regard to the degree of disability of an individual inasmuch as assessment to arrive at such precision goes counter to the provisions of the RPwD Act, 2016.

18. Before parting with this case, it has to be stated that the Judgments rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court, which has been referred in the aforesaid Paragraphs (in ***Sunanda Bhandare Foundation Vs. Union of India : (2018) 2 SCC 397*** (2) ***Vikash Kumar Vs. UPPC and Ors. : 2021 (5) SCC 370*** (3) ***Syed Bashir-uddin Qadri Vs. Nazir Ahmed Shah : (2010) 3 SCC 603*** (4) In ***Vikash Kumar Vs. UPPC and Ors. : 2021 (5) SCC 370I*** (5) ***Avni Prakash Vs. National Testing Agency (NTA) and Ors., : (2023) 2 SCC 286*** (6) ***Gulshan Kumar Vs. Institute of Banking Personnel Selection and Others : 2025 SCC OnLine 223***) constitute a beacon light that shows the direction in which, the executive should proceed in dealing with the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in the future.

19. During the course of hearing on 03.04.2025, it was informed that the 2nd year MBBS examinations are scheduled to commence from 07.04.2025, thereby compelling the Court to deliver this Judgment as expeditiously as possible. This impending urgency had rather compelled this Court to deliver this judgment in a hurry. Therefore, this Court could not appreciate the judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court in a threadbare manner.

20. In the above premise, the Writ Petition stands allowed. The Respondents are directed to permit the Writ Petitioner by granting compensatory time of 30 minutes in addition to one hour for every three hours for the second year MBBS examinations as well as the other MBBS examinations until the Writ Petitioner completes her course. No Order as to Costs.

21. In view of the fact that the 2nd year MBBS examinations are scheduled to commence from 07.04.2025, Ld. Counsel for the Respondent No.2 is directed to convey the gist of this Order to the Competent Authority forthwith for effective compliance.

22. Interlocutory Applications, if any, stand closed in terms of this order.

GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD, J

Dt: 04.04.2025

Note: Issue CC today

B/o. JKS/MNR

09

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GANNAMANENI RAMAKRISHNA PRASAD

WRIT PETITION No. 5316 OF 2025

04.04.2025

Dt: 04.04.2025

Note: Issue CC today

B/o. JKS/MNR