

News

The Supreme Court rejects a petition contesting the Telangana government's increase of the OBC quota to 42% in local bodies.



The petitioner was permitted by the court to rescind the plea and seek the proper remedy from the High Court.

A petition contesting the Telangana government's decision to increase the Other Backward Classes (OBC) quota in municipalities and panchayats to 42 percent, bringing the total

number of reservations in local bodies to 67 percent, was denied by the Supreme Court on Monday [**Vanga Gopal Reddy v. State of Telangana**].

The petitioner was permitted by a bench consisting of Justices Vikram Nath and Sandeep Mehta to withdraw the plea and go to the High Court.

"Upon being instructed, the petitioner's counsel states that he may be permitted to withdraw the petition under Article 32, allowing the petitioner to seek the necessary remedies from the jurisdictional High Court. As a result, the petition is dismissed with the liberty requested," the court ruled.

Vanga Gopal Reddy filed the case in opposition to the Telangana government's recent administrative decree that gave OBCs a 42 percent reservation in local body elections.

In accordance with the directive, the State Election Commission announced the schedule for the October 9–November 11 rural local body elections in five phases on September 29.

According to the petitioner, the government's choice went beyond the 50 percent reserve cap established by the Supreme Court in its rulings on local body quotas.

Justice Vikram Nath asked during the hearing why the case was being taken straight before the Supreme Court under Article 32 rather than via the High Court first.

The petitioner's attorney contended that the Supreme Court had previously considered identical arguments.

But Justice Nath noted that the Court has previously rejected petitions in similar circumstances, showing that accepting such pleas in the past does not always support using the Supreme Court's original jurisdiction.

The attorney clarified that although the High Court had scheduled a hearing on the case for October 8, it had rejected interim relief in a number of other petitions filed over the same subject.

"It was retained on the eighth by the High Court. I will explain why I have come here. They gave notice on the 26th. A few petitioners went before the High Court on the 28th. He argued that the Court had declined to stay the case.

According to Justice Sandeep Mehta, the High Court's denial of temporary relief alone was insufficient justification for invoking Article 32.

"You will come here under Article 32 if the High Court does not grant the stay," he inquired.

After then, the petitioner's attorney requested permission to withdraw the petition, which was granted.

Somiran Sharma, an advocate, filed the petition.