Date of Reserved for orders : 19.06.2026
Date of Pronouncement : 23.06.2026
Date of Uploading : 23.06.2026

APHC010556162023

[3580]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH AT AMARAVATI

WRIT PETITION No.28842 of 2023

Varampati Charan Kumar Reddy and Others ...Petitioner(s)

Vs.

The State Of Andhra Pradesh and Others ...Respondent(s)

****

Advocate for Petitioner: KAVITHA GOTTIPATI

Advocate(s) for Respondent(s): YELLA REDDY RAJANALA, S PARINEETA, GP FOR SERVICES III, J UGRANARASIMHA, RAMESH BABU TALLURI SC For S.V.UNIVERSITY,TIRUPATI

CORAM : THE CHIEF JUSTICE LISA GILL
SRI JUSTICE R RAGHUNANDAN RAO

DATE : 23.06.2026

P C : (per Hon'ble Sri Justice R. Raghunandan Rao)

Heard Ms. Kavitha Gottipati, for petitioners, Yella Reddy Rajanala, S. Parineeta, Government Pleader For Services-III,

J. Ugranarasimha, Ramesh Babu Talluri, learned Standing Counsel for S.V.University, Tirupati.

2. The petitioners are eligible and qualified to be appointed as Assistant Professors, as they have obtained necessary educational qualification for such appointment. They are aggrieved by G.O.Ms.No.71, dated 01.09.2023, G.O.Ms.No.91, dated 13.09.2023, G.O.Ms.No.97, dated 21.09.2023, and G.O.Rt.145, dated 11.10.2023, which fixed the number of faculty positions in the departments in Sri Venkateswara University and more specifically, the Geography department. Apart from this, they are also aggrieved by consequential recruitment notification, dated 13.10.2023, issued in relation to Sri Venkateswara University.

3. Under the aforesaid government orders, a scheme of rationalisation of various positions in the faculty of various universities, including M/s. Sri Venkateswara University, were analyzed and such positions were reduced in number. After such reduction of positions, notifications for recruitment to vacancies available after rationalisation were issued.

4. The principal contention of petitioners is that said process of rationalisation has been done in an arbitrary and untenable fashion which requires to be set aside. It is further contended that entire exercise has been conducted only for the purposes of reducing teaching positions in universities and not because such reduction is otherwise warranted.

5. As far as calling for applications is concerned, said notification has now been withdrawn and as such writ petition is infructuous to that extent. The question of whether rationalisation process conducted by respondent authorities is valid or not remains for consideration.

6. The Government of Andhra Pradesh, in the year 2017, had initiated a process of rationalisation of existing posts in various faculties in universities in the State. This process had resulted in reduction of number of faculty positions available in various universities. Thereafter, Notifications were issued for filling up vacant positions available after rationalization process. Both the notifications for recruitment as well as rationalisation proceedings were challenged in a batch of writ petitions in W.P.Nos.23770 of 2017 and batch. In the course of hearing of this batch, respondent authorities had informed the Court that said rationalisation process requires to be reconsidered and that a fresh rationalisation process would be initiated. Challenge to recruitment notifications, issued by various universities, was considered and a Learned Single Judge of this Court had disposed of batch of writ petitions on 05.03.2021 with certain directions. Aggrieved candidates filed writ appeals, by way of W.A No.214 of 2021 and batch, which came to be dismissed on 11.07.2023. S.L.P (Civil) No.15975 of 2023 and batch filed against these orders, are pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

7. The Andhra Pradesh State Council for Higher Education had constituted an Advisory Committee for rationalisation of faculty positions in State Universities, on 21.12.2021. Thereafter, the said Advisory Committee,

after taking into consideration various factors, had made certain recommendations which were accepted and brought into effect. By virtue of such a rationalization process, faculty positions available in universities came to be reduced.

8. Smt. Kavitha Gottipati learned counsel appearing for petitioner has taken this Court through correspondence and reports relating to impugned rationalization process. The learned counsel would argue that rationalization process under taken by respondents is in violation of “The UGC regulations on minimum qualifications for appointment of teachers and other academic staff in universities and colleges and measures for maintenance of standards in higher education 2018”. She would draw the attention of this Court to Regulation 12.1 of the said regulations, which read as follows:

> *“Teaching posts in universities, as far as feasible, may be created in pyramidal order, for instance, for one post of Professor, there shall be two posts of Associate Professors and four posts of Assistant Professor, per department”.*

9. She would contend that ratio set out in this regulation has not been followed for the purposes of ascertaining optimum faculty positions. She would further contend that there is no uniformity in the process undertaken by respondents; the selection and merging of departments has been done in an arbitrary fashion; the workload has been calculated without taking into account the Ph.D students who would have to be guided in their Ph.D programs; the requirement of faculty, for distance courses, under the UGC regulations has

not been taken into account and that self-financed course initiated under G.O.Ms.No.46, dated 26.07.2017, has not been taken into account for this purpose. The learned counsel would contend that this has resulted in a lopsided evaluation of required faculty positions. She would further contend that such a lopsided evaluation has affected careers of petitioners, in W.P.No.28842 of 2023, inasmuch as positions which would have otherwise been available for petitioners have now been deleted from faculty positions in Sri Venkateswara University.

10. The Registrar of Sri Venkateswara University has filed a counter affidavit. In the counter-affidavit, the methodology followed for computing number of teaching positions required in Sri Venkateswara University was also set out. It was pointed out that university had strictly implemented UGC guidelines, dated 07.11.2022, and there was no deviation from these requirements. It is contended by 3rd respondent that G.O.Ms.No.14, dated 13.02.2019, stipulated teaching workload for Assistant Professors as 16 hours per week apart from requiring 2 hours to be devoted, per day, to mentoring of students and 2 hours, per day, for research. It is contended that by virtue of these stipulations, there was adequate time available to Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors to undertake the work required from them.

11. The 3rd respondent has also set out faculty positions available in geography department, inasmuch as petitioners are seeking employment as Assistant Professors in geography department of 3rd respondent-university.

12. This Court has considered rival submissions and is of opinion that petitioners have not made out any case for interference.

13. The explanation given, in the counter-affidavit filed by 3rd respondent, sufficiently makes out a case that rationalization process has been undertaken in a proper manner and no interference is required.

14. A further aspect that needs to be considered is whether petitioners would have a vested right to insist that certain positions should be made available for recruitment. This aspect can only be answered in negative. Candidates such as petitioners do not have any vested right or interest to contend that a certain number of faculty positions should be available in university and that they should be permitted to participate in recruitment process for such faculty positions. The petitioners have not pleaded nor demonstrated, before this Court, any right or claim that petitioners would have for creation of a certain number of faculty positions.

15. In the circumstances, there are no merits in this Writ Petition and it is accordingly dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

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

LISA GILL,CJ **RAGHUNANDANRAO,J**

HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE LISA GILL

&

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE R. RAGHUNANDAN RAO

WRIT PETITION No.28842 of 2023

(per Hon'ble Sri Justice R. Raghunandan Rao)

23.06.2026

RJS