HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE SIXTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE APARESH KUMAR SINGH
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE G.M. MOHIUDDIN

WRIT PETITION NO: 26979 OF 2025

Between:

Abotula Brindaraka, S/o A.Srinivasa Rao, Aged about 21 years, Occ. Student, R/o H.No. 8-68, Gowtham nagar colony, Saroornagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep. by its Principal Secretary, Health, Medical and Family Welfare Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
2. The State of Telangana, Rep. by Its Principal Secretary, Youth Advancement Tourism and Culture (Sports) Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
3. The Kaloji Narayana University of Health Sciences (KNRUHS), rep. by Its Registrar, Warangal.

...RESPONDENTS

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 to issue an appropriate Writ, Order or Direction, more particularly one in the Nature of Writ of Mandamus, declaring the inaction of the Respondent No.3 in considering and taking appropriate action pursuant to the petitioner's email representations dated 15/01/2025 and 28/08/2025, forthwith withdraw the ban and the penalty imposed upon the petitioner as it is a violation of article 14, 19 and 21 of constitution of India, as illegal, arbitrary, unconstitutional and in violation of principles of natural justice and consequently direct the 3rd Respondent to permit the petitioner to submit his application and participate under NEET 2025 Category- A counseling, and further direct the respondents to extend the benefit of reservation under the Sports Quota as per G.O.Ms.No. 114

(HMandFW) Department dt. 5/7/2017, by carrying forward the period of two years, namely COVID-2020 and 2021, during which no sports competitions could be conducted due to lockdown, so as to ensure that the petitioner, who passed Intermediate in 2021, is not deprived of the benefit of the Sports Quota on account of such lost years.

IA NO: 1 OF 2025

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 to direct the 3rd respondent to consider and take appropriate action pursuant to the petitioner's email representations dated 15-01-2025 and 28-08-2025, forthwith withdraw the ban and the penalty imposed upon the petitioner as it is a violation of article 14 and 21 of constitution of India, permit the petitioner to submit his application and participate under NEET 2025 Category—A counselling, and further direct the respondents to extend the benefit of reservation under the Sports Quota as per G.O.Ms.No. 114 (HMandFW) Department dt. 5-7-2017, by carrying forward the period of two years, namely COVID-2020 and 2021, during which no sports competitions could be conducted due to lockdown, so as to ensure that the petitioner, who passed Intermediate in 2021, is not deprived of the benefit of the Sports Quota on account of such lost years. Pending disposal of the main Writ Petition.

Counsel for the Petitioner : SRI NAMBI KRISHNA

Counsel for the Respondent No.1 : SRI R.NAGARJUNA REDDY,
AGP FOR MEDICAL HEALTH FW

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : SRI G.PRAVEEN KUMAR, AGP FOR SPORTS

Counsel for the Respondent No.3 : SRI T.SHARATH,
SC FOR KNRUHS

The Court made the following: ORDER

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH

AND

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.M. MOHIUDDIN

WRIT PETITION No.26979 OF 2025

ORDER:

Heard Sri Nambi Krishna, learned counsel for the petitioner; Sri R.Nagarjuna Reddy, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Medical and Health for respondent No.1; Sri G.Praveen Kumar, Assistant Government Pleader for Sports for respondent No.2; Sri T.Sharath, learned Standing Counsel for respondent No.3-University and perused the record.

2. This writ petition is filed by a student and a National Level Fencing player, who has qualified for NEET-UG 2025 under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking writ of *mandamus* (i) to declare the inaction of the Kaloji Narayana University of Health Sciences (for short 'KNRUHS') in considering the email representations of the petitioner dated 15.01.2025 and 28.08.2025 as illegal; (ii) to declare the debarment of three years and penalty of Rs.20 lakhs imposed as illegal, arbitrary and unconstitutional; (iii) to declare the respondents to permit the petitioner to participate in NEET 2025 Category-A counselling, and (iv) to extend the benefit of reservation under the Sports Quota as per G.O.Ms.No.114

(HM&FW) Department, dated 05.07.2017, with a carry-forward of the COVID-19 affected years (2020-2021).

Factual Matrix

3. Shorn of unnecessary details, the facts, as chronicled in the petition, are that the petitioner qualified in NEET-UG 2024 and was allotted an MBBS seat under the Management Quota (Category-B) in the Mop-Up round of counselling for the academic year 2024-25. He failed to join the allotted College. Consequently, *vide* letter dated 28.12.2024, the University invoked the penalty clause and imposed a penalty of Rs.20 lakhs and a three-year debarment from admission to MBBS/BDS courses in the State of Telangana.

4. That the petitioner also qualified in the NEET-UG 2025 exam but was unable to apply due to the three-year debarment and the penalty of Rs.20 lakhs.

5. That the Government of Telangana had notified 0.5% reservation for sportspersons in MBBS/BDS courses under G.O.Ms.No.114 Department, dated 05.07.2017.

6. That when the Government of Telangana by G.O.Ms.No.2 dated 22.09.2020 wanted to withdraw the Sports Quota in MBBS/BDS without amending the statutory rules, framed

under G.O.Ms.No.114 Department, dated 05.07.2017, this Court in W.P.No.38738 of 2022 quashed the portion of the Government Order withdrawing the Sports Quota and restored the 0.5% reservation.

Contentions of the petitioner

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner's failure to join MBBS course in the allotted college was due to "financial difficulties" and lack of proper notice regarding the penalty clause; that the imposition of the penalty is excessively severe, contrary to principles of equity and justice, and the same also infringes upon the fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 14, 19, and 21 of the Constitution of India.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner also contended that despite of the existence of a statutory 0.5% Sports Quota reservation under G.O.Ms.No.114 dated 05.07.2017, which was upheld by this Court in ***Ravula Laxmi Reddy v. State of Telangana*** in W.P. No. 38738 of 2022, dated 04.01.2023, the petitioner claims that respondent No.3-KNRUHS has not provided a functional online mechanism to apply under this Quota in its 2024 or 2025 counselling process, and contends

that this omission effectively denied him his right to be considered for admission under this category.

Analysis and Reasoning

9. This Court in a pervious writ petition *vide* W.P. No.12797 of 2025, challenging the imposition of the penalty of Rs.20 lakhs and debarment for a period of three years as illegal, rendered its determination upholding the imposition of monetary penalty of Rs.20 lakhs and debarment for a period of three years, and this Court affirms the same view in the present matter.

Issue of penalty and debarment:

10. It is to be noted that the admission process, governed by G.O.Ms.No.114 dated 05.07.2017, as amended from time to time, is a structured and transparent mechanism. The amendment *vide* G.O.Ms.No.125 dated 22.09.2022 specifically enhanced the penalty from Rs.3 lakhs to Rs.20 lakhs and explicitly mandated debarment for three years for candidates, who, after being allotted a seat from the second phase of counselling onwards, fail to join. This amendment was a conscious policy decision to curb the pernicious practice of "seat blocking," which deprives meritorious candidates of opportunities. Further, the petitioner's plea of ignorance of this rule is an act of desperation, as the rules and notifications are

published in the public domain, and every candidate is expected to participate in the process with due diligence.

11. It is also to be noted that the petitioner's act of accepting a seat in a Mop-Up round and then not joining is not a mere lapse; it is an act that has a cascading effect, as the said act blocks a seat that could have been allotted to another deserving and waiting candidate, and thereby disrupts the entire admission schedule, and ultimately benefits private managements by allowing seats to be converted.

12. Further, the enhanced penalty of Rs.20 lakhs is intended to be prohibitive, ensuring that candidates do not treat seat allotment as a casual option to be accepted or rejected at will. The contention of the petitioner of financial hardship, while evoking sympathy, cannot be a ground to scrap away a rule designed for the larger public good.

13. It is trite law, settled by a catena of decisions of the Hon'ble Apex Court, that the process of admissions to professional medical courses is not a matter of private contract between an individual and an institution. It is a highly regulated state activity conducted in the nature of a trust for the benefit of all eligible candidates. The timeline for each phase of counselling from the first round to the Mop-Up round is

sacrosanct. The entire competitive process is built on the bedrock of certainty, fairness and estimation of subjective discretion. Any relaxation/deviation for one candidate, however genuine his reason may seem, or even if motivated by sympathy, would have a cascading effect, jeopardizing the chances of other candidates waiting in the queue and undermining the finality of the process thereby compromising the integrity of the system. Reference can be made to a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Medical Council of India v. Madhu Singh***[1] regarding the importance of adhering to schedules in academic matters.

14. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the judgment in ***Md. Rizwan Arfath and others v. State of Telangana and others*** in W.P. No. 40116 of 2022 and batch, dated 16.11.2022 to contend that the imposition of penalty of Rs.20 lakhs is illegal, it is to be noted that the core reasoning in said judgment was the failure of the University to produce the bonds allegedly executed by the students. The Court held that in the absence of the foundational document i.e., the bond, the penalty could not be enforced. However, in the present case, the penalty is not being enforced based on a bond but is a statutory consequence flowing directly from the amended rules

[1] (2002) 7 SCC 258

in G.O.Ms.No.125. Therefore, the aforesaid judgment, which was rendered in a different factual context and circumstances, is not applicable to the facts of the case and does not advance the case of the petitioner.

15. A law or rule is not arbitrary under Article 14 of the Constitution of India, if it is based on an intelligible differentia and has a rational nexus to the object sought to be achieved. The classification here is between candidates who comply with the reporting conditions to join the MBBS/BDS course on allotment of a seat and those who do not. This classification is intelligible and has a direct nexus with the object of ensuring a smooth, fair, and final admission process. The rule applies uniformly to all candidates in the same situation. Therefore, it cannot be said to suffer from the vice of arbitrariness.

16. In regard to the petitioner's challenge against the severity of the penalty of debarment for a period of three years, it is to be noted that, the Doctrine of Proportionality requires the Court to examine whether the restriction imposed by a rule is disproportionate to the object it seeks to achieve. The object here is crystal clear: to deter candidates from accepting a seat without a firm intention to join, thereby blocking a seat that could have gone to another candidate. "Seat blocking" is a

serious menace that disrupts the entire allocation process and is detrimental to the larger student community. The penalty of debarment for three years, though severe, is a calibrated response to this persistent problem. It is intended to impress upon candidates the gravity of the commitment they make when they consciously exercise their web options. It is not a punitive measure in isolation but a protective measure for the system as a whole. The increase in the monetary penalty to Rs.20 lakhs by the 2022 amendment underscores the seriousness with which the legislature views this issue. We find the penalty to be proportionate to the legitimate aim it seeks to achieve.

Issue in regard to the implementation of Sports Quota as per G.O.Ms.No.114 dated 05.07.2017:

17. The penalty of debarment of three years having been upheld by this Court, the question of implementation of Sports Quota reservation to the candidates for admission to MBBS and BDS courses for the year academic year 2025-2026, has been rendered academic in view of the fact that the petitioner has already been debarred for a period of three academic years *vide* letter dated 28.12.2024.

18. Further, this Court is of the view that the petitioner's plea to "carry forward" the years 2020 and 2021 on account of the

COVID-19 lockdown is a policy matter beyond its jurisdiction, as it is not within this Court's domain to prescribe any specific "carry-forward" formula. Further, the petitioner's comparison of the Sports Quota with Army or Physically Handicapped Quota's is misplaced, as the nature and eligibility criteria of these Quotas are fundamentally distinct. Therefore, this Court is of the view that there is no merit in the writ petition.

Conclusion

19. For the foregoing reasons, we hold that the action of the respondents in imposing a penalty of Rs.20 lakhs and debarring the petitioner for three years is neither illegal and arbitrary nor unconstitutional. It is a valid application of a rule designed to preserve the sanctity of a high-stakes admission process.

20. We also hold that this Court cannot direct the respondents to implement the Sports Quota for the academic year 2025-2026 by carrying forward the COVID-19 affected years (2021-2022). Therefore, the writ petition, being devoid of merit, is liable to be dismissed.

21. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Consequently, miscellaneous petitions, if any pending, shall stand closed.

SD/- B.REKHA RANI
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. One CC to SRI NAMBI KRISHNA, Advocate. [OPUC]
2. Two CCs to GP FOR MEDICAL HEALTH FW, High Court for the State of Telangana. [OUT]
3. Two CCs to GP FOR REVENUE, High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad. [OUT]
4. One CC to SRI T.SHARATH, SC for Kaloji Narayana Rao University of Health Sciences, Warangal. [OPUC]
5. Two CD Copies.

BSK

TKS

HIGH COURT

DATED:06/10/2025



ORDER

WP.No.26979 of 2025

DISMISSING THE WRIT PETITION
WITHOUT COSTS

9
ASM
27/10/25.