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

THURSDAY, THE THIRD DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

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

WRIT PETITION NO: 29129 OF 2026

Between:

ROSHINI KONTHAM, D/o. Dr. Ravindar Kontham Aged About 19 years Occupation Student R/o E-27, NCL Colony Pashan Pune Maharashtra-411008. Permanent Address H.No.2-125, Ashalapally, Kapulakanaparthy Village Sangam Mandal, Warangal District Telangana-506005.

...PETITIONER

AND

1. THE STATE OF TELANGANA, Represented by Principal Secretary Health, Medical and Family Welfare (C1) Department Dr. B.R Ambedkar Telangana Secretariat, Hyderabad, Telangana-500004
2. KALOJI NARAYANA RAO UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES, (KNRUHS) Represented by its Registrar Nizampura, Warangal, Telangana 506007

...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 a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ Order or Direction to set aside Sub-Rule a iii of Rule 3 of the Telangana Medical Dental Colleges Admission Admission into MBBS BDS Courses Rules 2017 as amended by GOMsNo150 Health Medical Family Welfare Department dated insofar as it excludes the children of employees of the Central Government and Central Government Corporations as being illegal arbitrary unreasonable discriminatory ultra vires and violative of Articles 14 and 15 of the Constitution of India Consequently declare the Petitioner as a Local

Candidate of the State of Telangana for all purposes of admission into MBBS & BDS Courses for the Academic Year 2026-27 under the aegis of Respondent No2-KNR University of Health Sciences and direct the Respondents to consider the Petitioner's candidature accordingly.

I.A. 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 to DIRECT Respondent No.2, pending disposal of the Writ Petition, to permit the Petitioner candidature for Admission into MBBS and BDS courses Under Competent Authority Quota and Management Quota for The Academic Year 2026-27 by treating her as a Local Candidate of the State of Telangana.

Counsel for the Petitioner: SRI. RAJKUMAR GUMMI

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: GP FOR MEDICAL HEALTH FW

Counsel for the Respondent No.2: SRI T. SHARATH, SC FOR KALOJI NARAYANA RAO UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES

The Court made the following: ORDER

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE SRI APARESH KUMAR SINGH
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.M.MOHIUDDIN

WRIT PETITION No.29129 of 2026

(CNR No.HBHC010602562026)

DATE: 03.09.2026

BETWEEN:

Roshini Kontham

....Petitioner

AND

The Telangana State, Represented by the Principal Secretary, Health, Medical and Family Welfare (C1) Department and another

....Respondents

ORDER

Heard Sri Rajkumar Gummi, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri T.Sharath, learned Standing Counsel for Kaloji Narayana Rao University of Health Sciences appearing for respondent No.2 and perused the record.

2. The present writ petition is filed with the following prayer:

> *".....issue a Writ of Mandamus, or any other appropriate Writ, Order or Direction to set aside Sub-Rule (a)(iii) of Rule 3 of the Telangana Medical & Dental Colleges Admission (Admission into MBBS & BDS Courses) Rules, 2017, as amended by G.O.Ms.No.150, Health, Medical & Family Welfare (C1) Department, dated 08.09.2025, insofar as it excludes the children of employees of the Central Government and Central Government Corporations, as being illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable,*

discriminatory, ultra vires, and violative of Articles 14 and 15 of the Constitution of India;
Consequently, declare the Petitioner as a Local Candidate of the State of Telangana for all purposes of admission into MBBS & BDS Courses for the Academic Year 2026-27 under the aegis of Respondent No.2-KNR University of Health Sciences, and direct the Respondents to consider the Petitioner's candidature accordingly;
pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice"

Factual Matrix

3. The petitioner, Roshini Kontham, is the daughter of Sri Dr. Ravindar Kontham. She was born on 04.10.2007 at Warangal, Telangana, and claims to be a permanent resident of Telangana, with her permanent address at H.No.2-125, Ashalapally, Kapulakanaparthy Village, Sangam Mandal, Warangal District, Telangana-506005. Petitioner qualified in NEET (UG)-2026, securing 451 marks out of 720 and an All-India Rank of 165346 in the General Category, and is thus eligible to seek admission to the MBBS/BDS courses for the Academic Year 2026-27.

4. The petitioner's father is an employee of the Council of Scientific & Industrial Research-National Chemical Laboratory (CSIR-NCL), an autonomous body functioning under the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Ministry of Science & Technology, Government of India (GOI). The petitioner's father joined CSIR-NCL on 16.09.2014 and has been posted at Pune, Maharashtra, since then. Consequent upon his official posting, the family, including the petitioner, relocated to Pune, and the petitioner pursued her

education at various schools in Pune, Maharashtra, from Class IX to XII.

5. The petitioner's educational details are as set out below:

Class	**Year of Study**	**Name of the Institution**	**Place**	**State**
XII	2024-25	Aditya English Medium School	Pune	Maharashtra
XI	2023-24	Aditya English Medium School	Pune	Maharashtra
X	2022-23	Lokseva e School	Pune	Maharashtra
IX	2021-22	Lokseva e School	Pune	Maharashtra

6. The Government of Telangana (erstwhile Andhra Pradesh) issued a Community, Nativity and Date of Birth Certificate vide Certificate No.6415 of 2000, dated .07.2000, certifying that the petitioner's father is a native of Sangam Mandal, Warangal District, Telangana. That the petitioner's education outside the State occurred solely on account of her father's official posting as an employee of CSIR – National Chemical Laboratory, Pune.

7. Upon publication of the Provisional Merit List dated 24.08.2026, the petitioner's name was reflected in the List of Ineligible Candidates at S.No.136. Immediately thereafter, the petitioner's father submitted a grievance/representation through *e*-mail dated 25.08.2026 to respondent No.2, requesting reconsideration of the petitioner's candidature as a Local Candidate. On the ground that the petitioner's father was an employee of CSIR – an autonomous organization under the Government of India and that

the case of the petitioner is covered by the judgment of this Court in W.P.No.23998 of 2026, dated 17.08.2026. Although the said grievance was submitted within the stipulated time, respondent No.2 did not accede to the petitioner's request and, consequently, the petitioner's name was omitted from the Final Merit List.

8. Aggrieved by the petitioner's exclusion from the benefit of the said proviso to Rule 3(a) as amended *vide* G.O.Ms.No.150, dated 08.09.2026, despite her having pursued education outside the State solely on account of her father's official transfer, the petitioner has approached this Court challenging the validity of the impugned provision to the extent that it excludes the children of employees of Central Government and Central Government Corporations and seeking consequential relief that the petitioner be declared a local candidate of the State of Telangana.

Submissions on behalf of the petitioner

9. The learned counsel for the petitioner advanced the following submissions hereunder:

i) That the classification made under the proviso to Rule 3(a)(iii) as introduced by G.O.Ms.No.150 dated 08.09.2025 is wholly arbitrary and unreasonable. The very object of the exception is to protect candidates who could not pursue their education within Telangana for the requisite period, not by choice, but on

account of the transferable nature of their parent's employment. Having recognised such hardship in respect of four categories of employees, there is no justification for excluding children of Central Government employees and employees of Central Government Corporations/Undertakings.

ii) That there is no rational or *intelligible differentia* between children of Telangana State Government employees and children of Central Government employees, such as employees of CSIR-NCL, insofar as the hardship arising from transfer is concerned. In both cases, the child is required to relocate outside the State on account of the parent's official transfer. The distinction based solely on the nature of the employer has no rational nexus with the object sought to be achieved by the Rule.

iii) That the classification is manifestly under-inclusive, as it excludes an identifiable class of similarly situated persons, namely, children of Central Government employees and employees of Central Government Corporations/Undertakings, who are equally liable to be transferred outside the State in the course of their employment and consequently suffer the same disability.

iv) That the petitioner is denied the benefit of local candidature solely on the basis of the nature of her parent's employer,

which is wholly unrelated to her educational hardship or her genuine connection with the State of Telangana. The relevant consideration ought to be the reason for studying outside the State and not whether the parent is employed by the State Government or the Central Government.

v) That having recognized the hardship caused by compulsory transfer of parents in the specified categories, it is arbitrary and unjustified to deny the same benefit to the petitioner merely because her father is employed by CSIR-NCL, an autonomous body under the Central Government.

vi) That this Court in the order dated 17.08.2026 passed in W.P.No.23998 of 2026, in an identical challenge, held that the proviso to Rule 3(a)(iii) shall, pending the issuance of a formal amendment, be read to include children of employees of the Central Government, Central Government Corporations, and Central Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs). The facts of the present case are materially similar, and, therefore, the petitioner is entitled to the same protection.

Submissions on behalf of the respondents

10. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for 2nd respondent has advanced the following submissions:

i) That the Courts ordinarily do not interfere with educational policy unless the same is shown to be manifestly arbitrary or perverse and no such vitiating factor exists in the prescription of domicile requirements in G.O.Ms.No.150.

ii) That the classification under the proviso to Rule 3(a)(iii) is founded on a rational basis, namely, the nature of the parent's employment and its nexus with the State of Telangana. The four categories enumerated in the proviso, namely, (i) employees of the Telangana State Government; (ii) officers belonging to the Telangana cadre of All India Services; (iii) Defence/CAPF personnel who have declared their hometown to be in Telangana; and (iv) employees of Corporations/Agencies/Instrumentalities under the Government of Telangana, share a common nexus with the State. The petitioner's father, being an employee of CSIR-NCL, an autonomous organisation under the GOI, does not fall within any of these categories. The distinction is founded on an intelligible differentia and bears a rational nexus with the object of the Rule.

iii) That the plea of under-inclusiveness is misconceived. While framing the proviso, the State was entitled to identify specific categories of employees whose service conditions have a direct nexus with the State. The mere extension of the benefit to

certain categories does not create a constitutional obligation to extend it to every category of employee liable to be transferred outside the State. The petitioner's relocation outside the State on account of her father's transfer does not confer eligibility under the proviso, which requires the conditions expressly prescribed therein to be satisfied.

iv) That the petitioner does not fall within any of the categories specified in the proviso to Rule 3(a)(iii), in view of, her birth in Warangal. Her father's nativity certificate and her permanent address in Telangana cannot substitute the conditions prescribed by the Rules for determining local candidature.

v) That reliance on the judgment in W.P.No.23998 of 2026 is misplaced, as the said writ petition was disposed of, taking note of the concession/assurance by the learned Advocate General on behalf of the State that appropriate clarification/amendment to G.O.Ms.No.150 would be issued to include children of Central Government employees, Central PSUs and Central Government Corporations within the ambit of the proviso.

11. We have taken note of the respective submissions urged and perused the material on record.

Consideration by this Court

12. The core issue for consideration before this Court is whether the exclusion of children of employees of autonomous organizations under the Central Government, such as CSIR-NCL, from the benefit of the proviso to Rule 3(a)(iii) is constitutionally valid, or whether such exclusion is arbitrary, discriminatory and violative of Articles 14 and 15 of the Constitution of India.

13. For a proper appreciation of the issue, it is necessary to examine the statutory framework governing admission to MBBS and BDS courses. Rule 3(a) of the Telangana Medical & Dental Colleges Admission (Admission into MBBS & BDS Courses) Rules, 2017 (for short '2017 Rules'), as amended by G.O.Ms.No.150, dated 08.09.2025, defines a 'local candidate' and, under the proviso to Rule 3(a)(iii), carves out exceptions in respect of specified categories of candidates who have studied outside the State of Telangana during the requisite four consecutive academic years. The proviso to Rule 3(a)(iii), as introduced by the aforesaid amendment, is reproduced hereunder for ready reference:

> *iii) Local area herein means the State of Telangana. Further, in case the candidate has not studied in any educational institution and has resided in the local area as stated at (ii) above, to be eligible for admission into undergraduate courses under 'Competent Authority Quota', the candidate should have appeared for the relevant qualifying examination in the State of Telangana:*
>
> *1. Provided that a candidate who studies outside Telangana for any period during the requisite 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 will be eligible to be considered if they fall under any of the below categories:

1. *Children of employees of the Telangana State Government who have served or are serving outside Telangana corresponding to the candidate's year/s of study outside Telangana.*
2. *Children of serving or retired officers belonging to the Telangana cadre of All India Services (IAS/IFS/IPS) who have served or are serving outside Telangana corresponding to the candidate's year/s of study outside Telangana.*
3. *Children of defence personnel/ex-servicemen/Central Armed Police Force service who, at the time of joining service, have declared their hometown to be in the State of Telangana and who have secured or are serving outside Telangana corresponding to the candidate's year/s of study outside Telangana.*
4. *Children of employees of a Corporation/ Agency/ Instrumentality under Government of Telangana, liable to be transferred anywhere in India as per the terms and conditions of his/her employment, who have served or are serving outside Telangana corresponding to the candidate's year/s of study outside Telangana."*

(Emphasis supplied)

14. A plain reading of the proviso reveals that the exception is narrowly tailored to cover only four specific categories of employees, namely:

i) employees of the Telangana State Government;

ii) officers belonging to the Telangana cadre of All India Services;

iii) defence personnel/Central Armed Police Force personnel who have declared their hometown to be in Telangana; and

iv) employees of a Corporation/Agency/Instrumentality under the Government of Telangana.

Conspicuously absent from the said list are children of employees of the Central Government, Central Government

Corporations, Central PSUs, and autonomous organisations under the Central Government, such as CSIR-NCL.

15. The object of the proviso to Rule 3(a)(iii) is to identify candidates with a genuine local connection to the State of Telangana. The exception is intended to benefit candidates who were compelled to pursue their education outside the State on account of their parents' official transfers where the parents are employees of the State Government.

16. It is to be noted that the State Government has a legitimate interest in ensuring that the benefit of local candidature is not extended to candidates who do not have a genuine and sufficient connection with the State. The State Government has identified above four categories of employees who have a direct nexus with the State Government and whose children are likely to have been displaced due to official transfers. The classification is based on the nature of the parent's employment, which is a reasonable and intelligible criterion.

17. It is apposite to note that the exclusion of children of employees of autonomous bodies under the Central Government cannot be said to be arbitrary or discriminatory. The State Government cannot be expected to extend the benefit of local candidature to all categories of employees who are transferred outside the State. The State Government has the power to draw a

distinction, and as long as the classification is reasonable and has a rational nexus with the object sought to be achieved, it cannot be struck down on the ground of under-inclusiveness. The State Government has chosen to extend the benefit to categories of employees having a direct nexus with the State Government, which is a constitutionally permissible classification.

18. It is alsc pertinent to note that the petitioner's father is an employee of CSIR-NCL, which is an autonomous organisation functioning under the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Ministry of Science & Technology, GOI. The Employment Certificate dated 20.08.2026 issued by CSIR-NCL specifically states that CSIR is an autonomous body-functioning under the GOI. The Service Record and Attestation Form of the petitioner's father further establish that his employment is with CSIR-NCL, an autonomous organization under the GOI.

19. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in ***State of Telangana v. Kalluri Naga Narasimha Abhiram***[1], while upholding the validity of the Rules, 2017 as amended by G.O.Ms.No.33 dated 19.07.2024, considered the scope and rationale of the proposed proviso to Rule 3, wherein it has observed, with reference to the said proviso, that candidates who pursued part of their education outside Telangana on account of the service exigencies of their parents in Government,

[1] SLP(C) Nos.21536-21588 of 2024 dated 01.09.2025

All India Services, Defence/Paramilitary Forces, or Corporations/Instrumentalities under the Government of Telangana, shall also be treated as local candidates upon submission of due certification from the competent authority.

20. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the aforesaid decision specifically referred to *'Corporations/Instrumentalities under the Government of Telangana'* and did not refer to Corporations/Instrumentalities under the Central Government. Pursuant to the aforesaid judgment, the State Government introduced the proviso to Rule 3(a)(iii) by issuing G.O.Ms.No.150 dated 08.09.2025, thereby carving out exceptions in respect of the four categories specified therein. The scheme of the proviso thus confines the benefit to specified categories of employees having a direct nexus with the State Government or with services falling within the categories expressly identified therein. Employees of autonomous organizations under the Central Government do not fall within any of the four categories expressly enumerated in the proviso.

21. Further, the petitioner's father being an employee of CSIR-NCL, which is an autonomous organization functioning under the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Ministry of Science & Technology, Government of India. CSIR-NCL is not a 'Corporation/Agency/Instrumentality under the Government of

Telangana' and does not fall within any of the four categories expressly covered by the proviso to Rule 3(a)(iii). The service records of the petitioner's father establish that his employer is CSIR-NCL. Thus, while CSIR-NCL functions autonomously under the GOI, the petitioner's father is not a regular employee of a Central Government Department; rather, he is an employee of an autonomous organization under the GOI.

22. The distinction between an 'autonomous body' and a 'Government organization/undertaking' is well-established. An autonomous body enjoys a certain degree of functional and financial autonomy, unlike a Government department or a Government-owned Corporation. The employees of autonomous bodies are not Government employees in the strict sense.

23. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***State of Maharashtra v. Bhagwan***[2], while reiterating the view taken in ***T.M. Sampath v. Ministry of Water Resources***[3], has held as under:

> ***26.*** *As per the law laid down by this Court in a catena of decisions, the employees of the autonomous bodies cannot claim, as a matter of right, the same service benefits on a par with the government employees. Merely because such autonomous bodies might have adopted the Government Service Rules and/or in the Governing Council there may be a representative of the Government and/or merely because such institution is funded by the State/Central Government, employees of such autonomous bodies cannot, as a matter of right, claim parity with the State/Central Government employees. This is more particularly, when the employees of such*

[2] (2022) 4 SCC 193
[3] (2015) 5 SCC 333

autonomous bodies are governed by their own Service Rules and service conditions. The State Government and the autonomous Board/body cannot be put on a par.

(Emphasis supplied)

24. The reliance placed by the petitioner on the decision of this Court in W.P.No.23998 of 2026 dated 17.08.2026 is misplaced, as the petitioner therein was the daughter of an employee of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation (ESIC), a statutory Corporation established under the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 and functioning under the administrative control of the Ministry of Labour and Employment, GOI, whereas in the present case, the petitioner's father is not a regular employee of a Central Government Department, but an employee of CSIR-NCL, which is an autonomous organisation functioning under the GOI. The distinction between a Central Government Corporation, such as, ESIC, and an autonomous organisation, such as, CSIR-NCL, is significant and cannot be glossed over.

25. Furthermore, the Writ Petition No.23998 of 2026 was disposed of on the basis of the fair and constructive concession/assurance made by the learned Advocate General. The Court expressly proceeded on that basis and did not adjudicate upon the constitutional validity of the proviso. In the present case, no such concession with respect to the employees of autonomous organizations has been made. On the contrary, the University has asserted that the exception is confined to categories of employees

having a direct nexus with the State Government and that the employees of autonomous organisations do not fall within the categories expressly specified in the proviso. Even otherwise, the concession recorded in W.P.No.23998 of 2026 specifically referred to Central Government employees, Central PSUs and Central Government Corporations and did not expressly extend to employees of autonomous organisations under the Central Government.

26. The petitioner's reliance on the Nativity Certificate is equally misplaced. The Nativity Certificate only establishes that the petitioner's father is a native of Telangana and that the petitioner's education outside the State was occasioned by his official posting. However, the Nativity Certificate does not override the specific provisions of the Rules, which prescribe a clear test for determining local candidature. The Rules require that the candidate's education outside the State must be on account of the service exigencies of the parent belonging to one of the specified categories in the proviso to Rule 3(a)(iii). The petitioner's father is not an employee of the State Government, an All India Services officer of the Telangana cadre, defence/CAPF personnel, or an employee of a Corporation/ Instrumentality under the Government of Telangana. Therefore, the petitioner cannot claim the benefit of the exception.

27. The petitioner's contention that the impugned Rule is violative of Articles 14 and 15 of the Constitution of India, is also misplaced,

as Article 14 of the Constitution guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. Article 14 of the Constitution does not require all laws to have universal application and permits the State to make reasonable classification, provided that such classification is founded on an *intelligible differentia* distinguishing those grouped together from others left out and that the *differentia* bears a rational nexus with the object sought to be achieved. Further, the petitioner's reliance on Article 15 of the Constitution is also misplaced, as the impugned Rule is based on the nature of the parent's employment and not on any prohibited ground under Article 15 of the Constitution. Thus, the exclusion of children of employees of autonomous bodies under the Central Government is neither arbitrary nor discriminatory and does not violate Article 14 or 15 of the Constitution.

Conclusion

28. For the foregoing reasons, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner is not entitled to claim local-candidate status under the proviso to Rule 3(a). The petitioner's father's employment with CSIR-NCL, which is an autonomous organisation functioning under the GOI, does not satisfy any of the Exceptions to Rule 3. The petitioner cannot derive any benefit from the direction issued in W.P.No.23998 of 2026 which was rendered in the factual background of that case and particularly on the basis of the fair

concession by the learned Advocate General. This Court finds no arbitrariness or violation of Article 14 of the Constitution in the classification made under the said Rule. Consequently, the petitioner cannot seek consideration for admission to the MBBS/BDS Courses pursuant to NEET (UG)-2026 as a local candidate under the Competent Authority Quota.

29. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed.

As a sequel, miscellaneous petitions, pending if any, stand closed. No costs.

SD/-P. PRAMOD NAIK
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

//TRUE COPY//

SECTION OFFICER

To,

1. One CC to SRI. RAJKUMAR GUMMI, Advocate [OPUC]
2. Two CCs to GP FOR MEDICAL HEALTH FW, High Court for the State of Telangana, at Hyderabad [OUT]
3. One CC to SRI T. SHARATH, SC FOR KALOJI NARAYANA RAO UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH SCIENCES [OPUC]
4. Two CD Copies

DAN

TKS

HIGH COURT

DATED: 03/09/2026

ORDER

WP.No.29129 of 2026



DISMISSING THE WRIT PETITION

WITHOUT COSTS

7 Copies

T.P

18/09/26