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

TUESDAY, THE FOURTEENTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

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

WRIT PETITION NO: 29503 OF 2025

Between:

A.Varshini, D/o Late A. Krishna, Aged 20 years, H.No. 4-446, Near Masjid, Suraram Colony, Quthbullapur, Medchal-Malkajgiri District, Telangana State - 500055.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary, Medical and Health Department, Secretariat Buildings, Saifabad, Hyderabad.
2. The Kaloji Narayan Rao University of Health Sciences, Rep by Its Registrar, Warangal, Telangana State

...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 (a). Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, declaring the Provisional Merit List dated 12.09.2025 and the Final Merit List dated 15.09.2025, to the extent of excluding the petitioner from consideration under the local candidate category, as illegal, arbitrary, and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India,

(b). Hold and declare that in view of Rule 3(ii) and (iii), the petitioner, having resided in Telangana since 2020, completed Intermediate in Telangana in 2022, and appeared for NEET-UG 2025 in Telangana, is entitled to be treated as a local candidate under the Competent Authority Quota,

(c). Direct the respondents to forthwith include the petitioner's name in the Final Merit List under the local candidate category for MBBS/BDS admissions for the academic year 2025-26 and permit the petitioner to participate in the counseling process.

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 respondent no.2 to forthwith include the petitioner's name in the Final Merit List under the local candidate category for MBBS/BDS admissions for the academic year 2025-26 and permit the petitioner to participate in the counseling process pending disposal of the above writ petition.

IA NO: 2 OF 2025

Between:

The Kaloji Narayan Rao University of Health Sciences, Rep by Its Registrar, Warangal, Telangana State

...PETITIONER/2nd RESPONDENT

AND

1. A.Varshini, D/o Late A. Krishna, Aged 20 years, H.No. 4-446, Near Masjid, Suraram Colony, Quthbullapur, Medchal-Malkajgiri District, Telangana State - 500055.

...RESPONDENTS/PETITIONER

2. The State of Telangana, Rep by its Principal Secretary, Medical and Health Department, Secretariat Buildings, Saifabad, Hyderabad.

...RESPONDENT/RESPONDENT

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 vacate the orders passed in W.P.No.29503 of 2025 dated 06-09-2025.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI E.SREENIVAS RAO, REP. FOR SRI SAGAR.A

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: SRI T.RAMESH,
AGP FOR MEDICAL HEALTH FW

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: 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. 29503 of 2025

ORDER:

Heard Sri E.Sreenivas Rao, learned counsel representing Sri A.Sagar, learned counsel for the petitioner; Sri T.Ramesh, learned Assistant Government Pleader for Medical and Health appearing for respondent No.1; and Sri T.Sharath, learned Standing Counsel for Kaloji Narayana Rao University of Health Sciences appearing for respondent No.2 and perused the record.

2. This writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, with the following prayer:-

> *".....(a). Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, declaring the Provisional Merit List dated 12.09.2025 and the Final Merit List dated 15.09.2025, to the extent of excluding the petitioner from consideration under the local candidate category, as illegal, arbitrary, and violative of Articles 14 and 21 of the Constitution of India;*
> *(b). Hold and declare that in view of Rule 3(ii) & (iii), the petitioner, having resided in Telangana since 2020, completed Intermediate in Telangana in 2022, and appeared for NEET-UG 2025 in Telangana, is entitled to be treated as a local candidate under the Competent Authority Quota;*
> *(c). Direct the respondents to forthwith include the petitioner's name in the Final Merit List under the local candidate category for MBBS/BDS admissions for the academic year 2025-26 and permit the petitioner to participate in the counselling process;*
> *(d). Pass such other and further orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interests of justice and equity."*

3. The petitioner assails the exclusion of her name from the Provisional Merit List dated 12.09.2025 and the Final Merit List dated 15.09.2025 for admission into MBBS/BDS courses under the Competent Authority Quota for the academic year 2025-26. The core grievance of the petitioner is her non-inclusion in the "local candidate" category.

4. The facts, briefly stated, are that the petitioner, born and purportedly a permanent resident of Telangana, studied from Class I to VIII (academic years: 2010-2018) in Telangana. The petitioner thereafter studied Classes IX and X (academic years: 2018-2020) in the State of Andhra Pradesh. The petitioner returned to Telangana to complete her Intermediate (Class XI and XII) in the academic years 2020-2022. The petitioner appeared for the NEET-UG 2025 examination in Telangana and upon being qualified in the NEET-UG 2025, sought admission under the 'competent authority quota'.

5. The respondents by applying Rule 3(a) of the Telangana Medical & Dental Colleges Admission (into MBBS & BDS Courses) Rules, 2017 as amended vide G.O.Ms.No.33 dated 19.07.2024 (hereinafter "the Rules"), did not classify her as a local candidate. The petitioner's representations to the University were implicitly rejected, leading to the filing of this petition.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that the respondents have adopted a rigid and erroneous interpretation of Rule 3(a) by considering only Clause (i) and ignoring Clauses (ii) and (iii). He contends that the petitioner, having resided continuously in Telangana since 2020, completed her Intermediate in Telangana in 2022, and appeared for NEET-UG 2025 in Telangana, squarely falls under the alternative criteria provided in Rule 3(a)(ii) and (iii). It is argued that this fulfils the "spirit" of the Rule and would provide a "purposive interpretation" to the Rule, which is to establish a genuine and continuous nexus with the State.

7. *Per contra,* the learned Government Pleader and the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent No.2, supported the impugned decision by relying on the Prospectus and the amended Rules. The learned counsel submitted in unison that the petitioner fails to satisfy the mandatory, conjunctive requirements of the Rules. They emphasized that the language of the Rule is clear and unambiguous and leaves no room for the interpretation, more so, as sought by the petitioner.

8. We have taken note of the contentions urged and given our anxious consideration to the matter.

9. In the present case for a proper adjudication, it is imperative to examine the relevant rule i.e., Rule 3(a), post the 2024 amendment *vide* G.O.Ms.No.33, dated 19.07.2024, (which

also forms part of the prospectus for admissions for the academic years 2025-26). The Rule reads as under:

> *"(a) A candidate for admission into undergraduate courses under 'Competent Authority Quota' in Telangana should be Indian National/ Person of Indian Origin- (PIO) / Overseas Citizens of India (OCI) card holder and shall fulfil the following provisions:*
> *i) If the candidate has studied in educational institutions in such local area for a period of not less than four consecutive academic years ending with the academic year in which he appeared or as the case may be first appeared in the relevant qualifying examination.*
> *Or*
> *ii) Where during the whole or any part of the four consecutive academic years ending with the academic year in which he appeared, or as the case may be, first appeared for the relevant qualifying examination, he has not studied in any educational institutions, if he has resided in that local area for a period of not less than four years immediately preceding the date of commencement of the relevant qualifying examination, in which he appeared or as the case may be first appeared.*
> *iii) Local area herein means the State of Telangana. Further, in case the candidate has not studied in any educational institutions and has resided in the local area as stated at (ii) above, to be eligible for admission into Under graduate courses under Competent Authority Quota, the candidate should have appeared for the relevant qualifying examination in the State of Telangana.*

10. A plain reading of the said Rule reveals two distinct channels to establish local candidature:

i. Study-based: Under Clause (i) of the Rules, a candidate must have studied in Telangana for four consecutive academic years ending with the academic year of the qualifying examination.

ii. Residence-based: Under Clause (ii) of the Rules, if a candidate has not studied in an educational institution, if he/she resided in Telangana for a period not less than four years immediately preceding the commencement of the relevant qualifying examination (Intermediate) in which he/she appeared or as the case maybe first appeared.

> Under Clause (iii) of the Rules, if a candidate has not studied in any educational institution and if he/she resided in Telangana for a period not less than four years immediately preceding the commencement of the relevant qualifying examination (Intermediate) in which he/she appeared or as the case maybe first appeared, to be eligible for admission into Under graduate courses and the candidate appeared for the relevant qualifying examination in the State of Telangana.

11. In regard to the Study-based channel, it is to be noted that the petitioner's qualifying examination is Intermediate, the academic year for which ended in 2022. The four consecutive academic years ending with this year would be 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22. Admittedly, the petitioner studied Classes IX and X (academic years 2018-19 and 2019-20) in Andhra Pradesh. She only studied Intermediate in Telangana for the years 2020-21 and 2021-22. Therefore, she has not studied for four consecutive academic years in Telangana ending with the year of her qualifying examination, and she fails to qualify under Clause (i).

12. In regard to the Residence-based channel, it is to be noted that it is an exception for those who have not studied in an educational institution. The petitioner, however, was a student throughout this period. More critically, the residency requirement under Clause (ii) is unequivocal: the candidate

must have resided in Telangana for four years immediately preceding the date of commencement of the relevant qualifying examination.

13. It is also relevant to note that the petitioner's relevant qualifying examination is Intermediate, and the petitioner commenced her Intermediate First Year in or around June 2020, which makes the four-year period "immediately preceding" from approximately mid-2016 to mid-2020. Further, the petitioner's own case is that she has been residing continuously in Telangana since 2020. This period commences at the end of the crucial four-year window stipulated by the Rule. Thus, the petitioner cannot claim, nor is there any evidence to suggest, that she resided in Telangana for the four years preceding June 2020. In fact, her educational records and the pleadings demonstrate that the petitioner studied in Andhra Pradesh until 2020. Consequently, the petitioner fails to satisfy the mandatory four-year residency period prescribed under Clause (ii). Since this foundational requirement is not met, the condition under Clause (iii) of appearing for the qualifying examination in Telangana, though satisfied, becomes irrelevant and is of no consequence.

14. The argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has a "strong nexus" with the State, while factually may be true to an extent, is legally untenable, as the

HIGH COURT

DATED: 14/10/2025

ORDER

WP.No.29503 of 2025



DISMISSING THE WRIT PETITION,

WITHOUT COSTS

PA
3/11/25

(7)