APHC010234852026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI **[3562]**
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY,THE NINETEENTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHENDU SAMANTA

WRIT PETITION NO: 12292/2026

Between:

1. A RAJASEKHAR GOWD, AGED 46 YEARS S/O LATE A. SRI VENKATASWAMY OCC OFFICE SUPERINTENDENT, O/O PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX, K.T. ROAD TIRUPATI - 517501.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. UNION OF INDIA, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY (REVENUE) MINISTRY OF FINANCE, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, NORTH BLOCK, NEW DELHI - 110001.
2. CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES, (CBDT) THROUGH ITS CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, MINISTRY OF FINANCE, NORTH BLOCK, NEW DELHI - 110001.
3. DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY, THE PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX TIRUPATI CHARGE, AAYAKAR BHAVAN, K.T. ROAD, TIRUPATI-517507
4. INQUIRY OFFICER IN THE CASE OF SHRI A RAJASEKHAR GOWD, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF INCOME TAX CENTRAL CIRCLE, TIRUPATI - 517507

...RESPONDENT(S):

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed therewith, the High Court may be pleased topleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ directing the Respondents to stay all the further departmental proceedings against the petitioner pursuant to the remitting order of the 3rd Respondent passed vide F.No. ARSGA/ig/PCIT/TPT/2025-2026 dated 20-11-2025 under Rule 15(1) of the CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965 till the Central Administrative Tribunal considers and passes appropriate orders in OA No 424/2026 while declaring the rejection order dated 23/04/2026 as arbitrary, illegal, and violative of principles of natural justice and pass

IA 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 may be pleased to stay all the further departmental proceedings against the petitioner pursuant to the remitting order of the 3rd Respondent passed vide F.No.ARSGA/ig/PCIT/TPT/2025- 2026 dated 20-11 -2025 under Rule 15(1) of the CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965 till the next date of hearing before the Central Administrative Tribunal, circuit Bench Amaravathi i.e., 23/07/2026 in the interest of justice and to avoid any miscarriage of justice and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1. ATI NAGA SURYA VENKATESH

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.

2. Y N VIVEKANANDA

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHENDU SAMANTA

WRIT PETITION NO: 12292/2026

ORDER: *(per Ravi Nath Tilhari, J)*

Heard Sri A.N.S.Venkatesh, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Y.Vivekananda, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.1 to 4.

2. Against the writ petitioner the remitting order was passed. Challenging those proceedings, the petitioner filed O.A.No.424 of 2026. He also prayed for grant of interim relief.

3. The Central Administrative Tribunal, Hyderabad (Telangana) by order dated 23.04.2026 rejected the prayer for interim relief. The order reads as under:

> "Heard Mr.ANS Venkatesh, learned counsel for the applicant.
> Admit
> Interim Relief, as sought in the O.A., is rejected.
> Issue notice to the respondents.
> Four weeks' time is granted to the respondents to file a reply in the matter.
> List the case, on 23.07.2026, before the Registrar's Court, for completion of pleadings.
> A copy of today's order to be sent to the respondents through email, to enable them to file reply, to support speedy adjudication and disposal."

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order is a non-speaking order and just one line. Prayer for interim relief has been rejected.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that Tribunal has fixed a short date and the matter is listed before the Tribunal on 23.07.2026 for completion of pleadings.

6. We have considered the aforesaid submissions and the impugned order as extracted above makes it evident that the order is non speaking order. No reason is assigned for rejection of the prayer of interim relief. Consequently, on the aforesaid ground, we allow the petition and quash that part of the order by which the interim relief prayer has been rejected.

7. It is well settled in law that the order must contain the reasons. The reasons are the back bone of the order. The impugned order does not stand for reasonable ground. The Tribunal shall reconsider the prayer for interim relief in accordance with law by affording opportunity of hearing to both the sides and expeditiously, if possible on the next date i.e., 23.07.2026 and if so not possible on that date within one week positively.

8. The Writ Petition stands allowed with the aforesaid observations and directions.

9. It is made clear that this Court is not observed anything on the matters in the matter either way.

No order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall also stand closed.

RAVI NATH TILHARI,J

SUBHENDU SAMANTA,J

Dated:19.06.2026
AG

291

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE RAVI NATH TILHARI

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHENDU SAMANTA

WRIT PETITION NO: 12292/2026

Dated:19.06.2026
AG