

***THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUJOY PAUL**
AND
***THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAMAVARAPU**
RAJESHWAR RAO
+WRIT PETITION No.21200 of 2024

% 08-11-2024

Mohd. Shujath Hussain

...Petitioner

vs.

\$ State of Telangana and Others

... Respondents

!Counsel for the Petitioner: Sri V.Raghunath, Senior Counsel, representing
Sri Mohammed Omer Farooq

^Counsel for Respondent No.1: Ms. Shalini, G.P. for Services-II

^Counsel for Respondent No.2 & 3: Sri Harender Pershad, Senior Counsel
Representing Sri A.Naren Rudra,
Standing Counsel for TSHC

<Gist :

>Head Note :

? Cases referred

1. W.P.(C).No.4598 of 2010 dated 10.12.2010
2. 1998 SCC OnLine Mad.433
3. 1999 SCC OnLine Kar574
4. 2002 SCC OnLine AII 1182
5. 2017 SCC OnLine Mad37540
6. 2018 SCC OnLine Bom 2248
7. (1990)2 SCC 352
8. 2024 SCC OnLine SC 1838
9. 1999 SCC OnLine Kar 574
10. 2018 SCC Online Bom 2248
11. (1990) 2 Supreme Court Cases 352
12. 2024 SCC Online 1838
13. (2004) 6 SCC 264

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA
HYDERABAD

* * * *

WRIT PETITION No.21200 OF 2024*(Per Hon'ble Sri Justice Sujoy Paul)*

Between:

Mohd. Shujath Hussain

...Petitioner

vs.

State of Telangana and Others

... Respondents

JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED ON: 08.11.2024

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUJOY PAUL
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAMAVARAPU RAJESHWAR RAO

1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments? :
2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
Marked to Law Reporters/Journals? :
3. Whether His Lordship wishes to
see the fair copy of the Judgment? :

SUJOY PAUL, J_____
NAMAVARAPU RAJESHWAR RAO, J

**THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE SUJOY PAUL
AND
THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE NAMAVARAPU
RAJESHWAR RAO**

WRIT PETITION No.21200 OF 2024

ORDER: *(Per Hon'ble Justice Sujoy Paul)*

This petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution challenges the constitutionality of Rules 5.3 and 7(i) of the **Telangana State Judicial (Service and Cadre) Rules, 2023** (impugned Rules) which were brought into force in exercise of power under *proviso* to Article 309 of the Constitution through G.O.Ms.No.36, dated 10.06.2023. The consequential recruitment notification dated 10.04.2024 which is making it obligatory for the candidates to be conversant in Telugu language and scheme of written examination providing for translation from English to Telugu and *vice-versa* without providing the option of being conversant in Urdu and translation in Urdu is also called in question in this petition.

Facts:

2. The petitioner is a practicing advocate and submitted his candidature as Civil Judge pursuant to notification dated 10.04.2024. The petitioner has studied in Urdu medium during his schooling and has not studied in Telugu medium. The 12th certificate and graduation certificate are placed on record to

substantiate the same. The petitioner also filed his enrolment certificate and certificate of practice.

3. The petitioner appeared in the qualifying examination and cleared it. After qualifying the examination, the petitioner was permitted to write the main written examination subject to outcome of the instant writ petition. The impugned Rules and the notification are coming in his way, and therefore, the present writ petition is filed.

Contention of the petitioner:

4. Sri V. Raghunath, learned Senior Counsel representing Sri Mohammed Omer Farooq, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the impugned Rules were introduced for the first time in the judicial service pursuant to an amendment vide G.O.Ms.No.3, dated 06.01.2020 amending the Telangana State Judicial (Service and Cadre) Rules, 2017 (Rules of 2017) (Annexure P-3). The Rules of 2017 did not prescribe the requirement of proficiency in Telugu language as a mandatory condition. The Andhra Pradesh State Judicial Service Rules, 2007 (Rules of 2007) were in vogue till 2017, but did not contain any requirement of proficiency in Telugu language as a condition for recruitment as a Judicial Officer.

5. It is canvassed that Urdu is recognized as an official language under Article 345 of the Constitution pursuant to amendment vide Act No.30 of 2017 to the Telugu Official Languages Act, 1966 (Official Languages Act). Since Urdu has been given the status of second official language in this state, it is arbitrary and unjust in not providing an option of being conversant with Urdu or Telugu in the Rules for recruitment for Civil Judges. In addition, it is urged that Urdu is recognized as a language of Court in 31 districts out of 33 districts in the State of Telangana which is evident from notification vide G.O.Ms.No.51 dated 17.05.2022 issued in exercise of power under Section 272 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. Learned Senior Counsel submits that it was never mandatory for the candidates to study Telugu and such a requirement of being proficient in Telugu was never part of the statute before impugned Rules came into being. Thus, impugned Rules are manifestly arbitrary and fail to consider that the Telangana region has historically being a multi-cultural State. The people from various regions of the country speaking various languages reside in Telangana. Urdu language has always been an integral part of the culture and ethos of the State and State has always recognized itself as a bilingual State warranting equal recognition to Telugu and Urdu both. In similar situation, the West Bengal Judicial Service Examination provides the option

of translating from English to Bangali/Hindi/Urdu/ Nepali/Snatali.

6. It is further pointed out that teaching of Telugu became mandatory in the State of Telangana in a faced manner only pursuant to the Telangana (Compulsory Teaching and Learning of Telugu in Schools) Act, 2018. Learned Senior Counsel, by taking this Court to the counter of respondent Nos.2 and 3, contended that the principal reason assigned for introducing offending provision in the impugned Rules is that the majority of population in Telangana State speaks and understands Telugu language. The State has forgotten that more than 15% people in Telangana are proficient in Urdu. The reason assigned in the said counter is that proficiency in Telugu is necessary for efficient dispensation of justice as various critical judicial process and majority of individuals involve in the process of examination of witnesses, identification parade, recording of evidence, etc., takes place in Telugu. By taking assistance from Rule 114 of Civil Rules of Practice and Rule 57 of Criminal Rules of Practice, learned Senior Counsel submits that there exist enabling provision for translation, and therefore, the impugned provision has no basis.

7. It is strenuously contended by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the impugned provision excludes the persons

proficient in Urdu like the petitioner from the process of recruitment to the judiciary. This artificial classification has no rational nexus with the object sought to be achieved. The impugned provision is arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution. The petitioner, although is not questioning the competence of respondents in prescribing the regional language test as part of process of recruitment to the judicial services, questioning the impugned provision and notification being arbitrary and discriminatory in nature.

Stand of respondent Nos.2 and 3:

8. Sri Harender Pershad, learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent Nos.2 and 3, opposed the petition on the basis of counter filed. It is submitted that the impugned provision became part of statute by considering linguistic demography of Telangana. Telugu is the first language of at least 77% of population of Telangana, and is therefore, predominantly used language in the State. All the trial Courts in Telangana handle cases where the complaints filed by the complainants and statements recorded under Cr.P.C., and Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 are predominantly in the vernacular Telugu language. Furthermore, victims in criminal cases often communicate in Telugu. Dying declarations and statements under the relevant provisions are also

recorded in Telugu in order to ensure accuracy and authenticity. Furthermore, during critical judicial processes, such as identification parades, examination of witnesses and suspects and recording of evidence in open Court, the majority of individuals communicate in Telugu. This linguistic preference underscores the need for judicial proceedings to accommodate and reflect the use of Telugu. The Civil Judges are required to rely on documentary evidence which is predominantly written in Telugu. In this backdrop, the use of Telugu language in the judicial process is not just preferable, but also essential for the proper administration and dispensation of justice. This decision of requirement of proficiency in Telugu is taken as a policy decision which does not violate Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

9. Learned Senior Counsel further submits that the *vires* of a Rule can be tested on limited grounds such as infringement of fundamental rights or lack of legislative competence, but not on the basis of alleged contravention of Article 345 of the Constitution. Article 345 merely confers upon the State Legislature a discretion to designate one or more languages for official purposes within the State. The provision pertains to broader official language framework of the State and has no

relation with imposition of Telugu proficiency as a criterion for judicial appointments. Resultantly, the argument that the Rules in question infringe Article 345 is legally untenable.

10. Learned Government Pleader further submits that the petitioner submitted his candidature and participated in preliminary examination being fully aware of the fact that he is required to demonstrate his proficiency in Telugu by passing the requisite test. After submitting the candidature and participating in the preliminary examination without any demur, the petitioner cannot be permitted to challenge the impugned provisions. In other words, it is submitted that the petitioner with eyes wide open to the criteria of proficiency in Telugu participated in the selection without any objection. Therefore, he is 'estopped' from challenging the said provision in this petition. While filling up the online application form, the candidate was required to respond with either 'YES' or 'NO' to the query regarding Telugu proficiency. The petitioner unequivocally declared 'YES' in response to this query, thereby affirming his proficiency in Telugu. The petitioner subsequently took a U-turn and filed this petition which is not entertainable. For this reason, it is clear that declaration given by the petitioner in the application form where he declared himself to be proficient in Telugu language runs contrary to paras 3, 4 and 5

of writ affidavit. It is forcefully contended that requirement of Telugu proficiency by no stretch of imagination can be termed as arbitrary and discriminatory.

11. It is further argued that the scope of Official Language Act is very limited and cannot be stretched to the extent suggested by the present petitioner. The similar question cropped up before other High Courts on the basis of similar provision of Official Languages Act applicable to such States, but High Courts have declined relief based on similar grounds.

12. The argument that the impugned provision creates a class within the class and discriminatory in nature, is without any basis. The provision merely prescribes that the candidate who desirous to become judicial officer must be conversant with Telugu and such a rule is applied uniformly for all candidates without any arbitrary classification. Thus, it cannot be said to be violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution.

13. It is common ground that Urdu is acknowledged for the purpose of Section 272 of Cr.P.C. Telugu still remains the predominant language required for conducting effective judicial proceedings and official Court business in the State of Telangana. Countering the argument that Telugu proficiency was introduced

for the first time in 2020, it is submitted that this statement is misleading and contrary to record. The requirement of Telugu language proficiency is in vogue for nearly 60 years in the State. It is urged that earliest rules were the A.P. State and Subordinate Service Rules, 1962 (Rules of 1962) whereunder Rule 13-A prescribed Telugu proficiency as a qualification for serving the district judiciary. The Rules of 1962 were superseded and substituted by A.P. State and Subordinate Service Rules, 1996 (Rules of 1996) whereunder Rule 13 also prescribes proficiency in Telugu language. The Rules of 1996 were also stood superseded and substituted by Rules of 2017. Pursuant to the Rules of 2017, the High Court issued several notifications for recruitment of judicial officers while prescribing the requirement of Telugu proficiency which includes the notification dated 08.03.2019. The requirement of Telugu proficiency was formally introduced in the Rules of 2017 by G.O.Ms.No.3 dated 06.01.2020. Thereafter, the Rules of 2017 were superseded and substituted by the instant rules. Therefore, it is absolutely incorrect to state that the requirement of Telugu language proficiency is introduced for the first time in 2020.

14. Lastly it is submitted that principle relating to classification applies only when two identically situated individuals are treated

differently. In the instant recruitment, all the candidates are uniformly required to meet the same language proficiency criteria and pass the same examination. Thus, there is no unreasonable classification and there exists a nexus with the object sought to be achieved.

15. In nut shell, the submission of Sri Harender Pershad, learned Senior Counsel appearing for respondent Nos.2 and 3, is that:-

- (i) No fundamental right of the petitioner was breached.
- (ii) It is the prerogative of the employer to prescribe the language in the interest of functional excellence.
- (iii) There is no breach of Articles 14, 16 and 29 of the Constitution of India.
- (iv) Prescription of another language and expectation of proficiency is not unknown to law.
- (v) There is no discrimination or arbitrariness or abuse of power in introducing the aforesaid Rules.

16. In support of above submissions, he placed reliance on the following judgments:

- i) **Judgment of Guwahati High Court in Smt.Kumari Arti v. The State of Assam¹;**
- ii) **V.Rajasekaran v. UT of Pondicherry²;**
- iii) **Anjuman-E-Tarrequi-E-Funkaran-E-Urdu v. State of Karnataka³;**
- iv) **U.P.Urdu Development Organisation v. State of U.P.⁴;**
- v) **P.Aruljothi v. Union of India⁵;**
- vi) **Shobhit Gaur v. State of Maharashtra⁶;**

¹ W.P.(C).No.4598 of 2010 dated 10.12.2010

² 1998 SCC OnLine Mad.433

³ 1999 SCC OnLine Kar574

⁴ 2002 SCC OnLine AII 1182

⁵ 2017 SCC OnLine Mad37540

- vii) **Hindi Hitrakshak Samiti v. Union of India**⁷;
- viii) **Legal Attorneys and Barristers Law Firm v. Union of India**⁸.

Stand of State of Telangana:

17. Learned Government Pleader for respondent No.1 submits that although counter has not been filed, para-wise remarks by way of instructions are received. A copy thereof is supplied to the Court. The stand of respondent No.1 is that the requirement of proficiency in Telugu is not for the first time introduced in Telangana. In the joint State of Andhra Pradesh also, such a requirement was there from time immemorial. Reliance is placed on the Telangana Official Language Act, 1966. It is further submitted that in various recruitments, Telugu was prescribed as essential language. Proficiency in Telugu is necessary for efficient administration of justice. Section 3 of Telugu Official Language Act, 1966 provides that Telugu Official Language Act, 1966 provides that Telugu is the first language, whereas, Urdu will be the second language. The petitioner, while filling-up online application filled the answer as “Yes” against the query whether he has proficiency in Telugu. After having filled up such response in “Yes”, the petitioner is estopped from taking a different view and

⁶ 2018 SCC OnLine Bom 2248

⁷ (1990)2 SCC 352

⁸ 2024 SCC OnLine SC 1838

challenge the impugned Rules. No fundamental right of the petitioner is infringed.

Rejoinder submission:

18. In rejoinder, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner placed heavy reliance on Rules of 2007 to bolster the submission that Rule 21 prescribes about “Tests”. A minute reading of this Rule makes it clear that Civil Judges and District Judges in direct recruitment were exempted from passing any language test and it was expected that Academy will prepare the necessary curriculum for imparting training to the judicial officers. The same practice can still be continued. The proficiency test in Telugu was prescribed for the first time in year 2018.

19. Lastly, learned Senior Counsel submits that although the petitioner has answered as “Yes” against the entry regarding proficiency in Telugu in online form, the said action of the petitioner was under compulsion, because if the petitioner would have answered it as “No”, his application would not have been accepted at all.

20. Thus, promptly, thereafter he submitted a letter dated 06.08.2024 seeking modification of “Yes” to “No”. The said letter is

duly received by official respondents. Thus, impugned provisions may be set aside.

21. The parties confined their arguments to the extent indicated above.

22. We have heard the parties at length.

Findings:

23. Before dealing with rival contentions, it is apposite to reproduce the provision of Rules which are called in question in this petition:

“(5.3) Proficiency in Telugu Language: The candidates applying for the posts of District Judge and Civil Judge under direct recruitment and recruitment by transfer, must be able to read, speak and write the Telugu language fluently and shall pass test as may be prescribed by the High Court.

7)(i) The High Court shall conduct written examinations consisting of three papers i.e., (I) Civil Law (II) Criminal. Law and (III) English, that includes Translation from English to Telugu language and Telugu to English language, Essay Writing, Grammar and Vocabulary carrying 100 marks each, having a duration as fixed by Court from time to time for the post of Civil Judge (Junior Division) and the High the post of District Judge. English paper is divided into two parts. Part-I carries 30 marks and Part II carries 70 marks. In Part-I the candidate's ability to understand his / her proficiency in Telugu language will be assessed. Candidate is required to translate from English .to Telugu and Telugu to English. In Part-II, candidate's ability in Essay writing, Grammar and vocabulary will be assessed. The Essay Writing test shall be on Legal subjects only. Candidate has to secure 50 % marks in each part to qualify in the written examination: 8 Provided that the Paper-III shall be considered only as a qualifying examination and marks

secured in the said Paper-III shall not be included in calculating the aggregate for short listing for viva voce test.”

24. The bone of contention of the petitioner is that admittedly Urdu is recognized as second official language in the present State. The notification dated 17.05.2022 (annexure-P12) issued in exercise of power under Section 272 of C.P.C. recognizes Urdu in 31 districts out of total 33 districts. The proficiency in Telugu became statutory requirement only from 2018. Above points deserve serious consideration. However, before dealing with aforesaid points, it is apposite to mention that, it is not in dispute between the parties that before specific Rules came into being for judicial officers, their services were governed by Rules of 1962. Thereafter, Rules of 1996 came into being and governed their services. In Rule 13 (a) of Rules of 1962 and Rule 13 of Rules of 1996, it was made clear that every person who was appointed to a service, after a cutoff date, during the probation period must pass language test in Telugu, failing which, his/her probation will not be extended. Thus, it is not in dispute that the passing of Telugu test was an essential requirement upto 2007.

25. The exemption in Rule 21 of Rules of 2007 was given to the category of Civil Judges and District Judges with a view that proficiency in Telugu can be achieved in Judicial Academy.

However, the respondents in their wisdom decided to again introduce requirements of proficiency in Telugu.

26. The ancillary question is **whether any such requirements can be held to be arbitrary and discriminatory in nature?**

27. This is trite that it is in the province of the employer to decide about the conditions of service, eligibility and qualification etc. Employer is the best Judge to decide about these aspects. The scope of judicial review on these aspects is very limited. Unless such prescription of qualification, eligibility etc., is violative of fundamental rights, suffer from arbitrariness or discrimination, interference cannot be made. Another view is possible cannot be a ground for interference.

28. Justice Amitav Roy (as his Lordship then was) speaking for the Division Bench of Gauhati High Court opined that the proficiency in Assamese language is in the interest of the functional excellence and cannot be interfered with. Interestingly, in the said case, the proficiency in Assamese was prescribed by way of advertisement and there was no statutory backing for the same. Yet, interference was declined by the Court by holding thus:

“21. Assimilation of Language Paper having regard to the purpose sought to be achieved thereby, in the context of

excellence in service also cannot be repudiated to be impertinent or insignificant. A visible nexus between such prescription and the object sought to be achieved is discernible which can by no means be undermined. In any view of the matter, the High Court being the best judge of the exigencies of service, it is empowered to model the curriculum suited thereto to ensure the desired level of performance in service, the Grade-III thereof in particular being the foundation on which the institutional edifice is assuredly built.

22. Constitutional and statutory reinforcement in this regard is traceable to Article 345 of the Constitution of India and the Assam Official Language Act, 1960. Though the Rules as such do not disclose the requirement of assessment of the trainees on their proficiency in the Language Paper and the advertisement as well did not spell out the same, having regard to the authority and discretion left to the High Court to configure the curriculum and administer the pre-appointment qualifying examination, the petitioner's plea of change of the rules of the game in course of the selection process is wholly unconvincing."

29. The Madras High Court in **V. Rajasekaran** (supra) opined that no directions can be issued to conduct the entrance test in Tamil medium also. There is no breach of Article 29(2) of the Constitution. Likewise, Karnataka High Court in **Anjuman-E-Tarrequi-E-Funkaran-E-Urdu v. State of Karnataka**⁹, opined that it is in the wisdom of State Government to chose to impose such condition for better efficiency of the administration. This will not violate any minority rights.

30. The Allahabad High Court had an occasion to consider the prayer to prepare examination paper in bilingual language (Hindi and Urdu) as per the official language of State of Uttar Pradesh in

⁹ 1999 SCC OnLine Kar 574

compliance of Section 3 of Uttar Pradesh Official Language Act, 1951 which is *pari materia* to official language act of Telangana. The High Court opined that the action of respondents in not providing question papers in Urdu language cannot be said to be arbitrary or violative of Article 14 of the Constitution.

31. The next reliance was on the judgment of High Court of Bombay in ***Shobhit Gaur v. State of Maharashtra and Others***¹⁰. Interestingly, the following portion of the Recruitment Rules was subject matter of challenge before Bombay High Court:-

“(d) Knowledge of Marathi:-

Candidate must have sufficient knowledge of Marathi so as to enable him to speak, read and write in Marathi and to translate with facility from Marathi into English and vice versa. Such knowledge must be certified.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

32. If this clause of rule of Maharashtra Judicial Service is examined in juxtaposition to the impugned rules, it will be clear that there is complete similarity in the rules as well as the legislative intent behind it. The High Court of Bombay considered para No.2.6 of 118th Report of Law Commission of India. The relevant portion reads as under:

“2.6 Knowledge of local language has assumed considerable importance in recent times, more so in view of section 2 of the Official Language Act and section 272 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 and section 137(2) of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 Eleven States have prescribed knowledge of

¹⁰ 2018 SCC Online Bom 2248

local language as an essential qualification. In the rules of some States, a provision is found requiring proficiency in one more language. At least in one state, power is conferred on the concerned authority to prescribe knowledge of a third language too.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

33. After considering the said report, the Division Bench opined that the rule reproduced herein above satisfies the tests laid down by Article 14 of the Constitution and therefore challenge to the said rule was repelled. The Apex Court in ***Hindi Hitrakshak Samiti v. Union of India***¹¹ came to hold that the prescription of medium of language is in the realm of policy decision of the State and therefore there is very little scope of interference. The Apex Court in a recent order in ***Legal Attorneys and Barristers Law Firm v. Union of India***¹² opined as under:-

“2. The requirement of obtaining **proficiency in the language of the State for appointment to the District Judicial Service is a valid requirement.** The judicial officers on appointment to the District Judiciary have to appreciate evidence in the language of the state. The imposition of such a requirement is manifestly proper and, in any event, raises an issue of policy. We, therefore, decline to entertain the petition.”

(Emphasis Supplied)

34. The Apex Court in a different context in ***Usha Mehta v. State of Maharashtra***¹³, came to hold as under:-

“10. ...While imposing regulations, the State shall be cautious not to destroy the minority character of institutions. It is not the case of the petitioners herein that the respondents prevented them from teaching Gujarati

¹¹ (1990) 2 Supreme Court Cases 352

¹² 2024 SCC Online 1838

¹³ (2004) 6 SCC 264

language. On the other hand, they are only challenging the compulsory imposition of Marathi language for students and asking for a right “not to learn” Marathi language while living in the State of Maharashtra. The regulation in this case imposed by the State of Maharashtra upon the linguistic minority right is to make Marathi language a compulsory course in school syllabi. The issue for resolution here is to find **whether** this action is reasonable or not. The impugned policy decision was taken by keeping in view the larger interest of the State, because the official and common business are carried on in that State in Marathi language. **A proper understanding of Marathi language is necessary for easily carrying out the day-to-day affairs of the people living in the State of Maharashtra and also for proper carrying out of daily administration. Hence the regulation imposed by the State of Maharashtra upon the linguistic minorities to teach its regional language is only a reasonable one.** This Court ruled that the right of minorities to establish and administer educational institutions of “their choice” under Article 30(1) read with Article 29(1) would include the right to have choice of medium of instruction...”

35. In the same judgment, it was further held as under:-

“...In our view the resistance to learn the regional language will lead to alienation from the mainstream of life resulting in linguistic fragmentation within the State, which is an anathema to national integration...”

36. The notification dated 17.05.2022 (Annexure P.12) on which heavy reliance is placed by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner shows that it is issued in exercise of power under Section 272 of Cr.P.C. This prescription, by no stretch of imagination, provides any enforceable right to the petitioner to wriggle out of the requirement of proficiency in Telugu.

37. Thus, viewed from any angle, it cannot be said that the provision of Recruitment Rules called in question are arbitrary,

discriminatory or violative of Article 14 of the Constitution. The impugned Rules have a rationale behind their introduction and a valid purpose sought to be achieved. Since the decision taken by the respondents is in the province of 'policy decision' for betterment of judicial administration, it cannot be stuck down merely because another view is possible.

38. Accordingly, the petition is devoid of merits and therefore dismissed. No costs. Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE SUJOY PAUL

JUSTICE NAMAVARAPU RAJESHWAR RAO

Date: 08.11.2024
Note: L.R. be marked.
B/o. TJMR