

**National Human Rights Commission**  
**Manav Adhikar Bhawan Block-C, GPO Complex, INA,, DELHI -110023**

ADVOCATE YENNAM BALACHANDER REDDY,  
 HYDERABAD HYDERABAD , TELANGANA  
**Dated: 10/06/2026**

Dear ADVOCATE YENNAM BALACHANDER REDDY,

The Commission has recieved your complaint and it has assigned diary number as **13208/IN/2026** with the following details:-

**Complainant Details**

<b>Name:</b>	ADVOCATE YENNAM BALACHANDER REDDY		
<b>Mobile:</b>	9959850723	<b>Email:</b>	advocate.bcreddy@gmail.com
<b>Address:</b>	HYDERABAD		
<b>District:</b>	HYDERABAD	<b>State:</b>	TELANGANA

File Uploaded suceesfully ( COMPLAINT.pdf )

**Victim Details**

<b>Victim Name:</b>	TELANGANA STATE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION EXAM ASPIRANTS	<b>Gender:</b>	Both
<b>Religion:</b>		<b>Cast:</b>	
<b>Address:</b>	HYDERABAD		
<b>District:</b>	HYDERABAD	<b>State:</b>	TELANGANA

**Incident Details**

<b>Incident Place:</b>	HYDERABAD, TELANGANA	<b>Incident Date:</b>	08/06/2026
<b>Incident Category:</b>	DISPARITIES IN EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES		
<b>Incident District:</b>	HYDERABAD	<b>Incident State:</b>	TELANGANA
<b>Is it filed before any Court / State HRC</b>	No		
<b>Incident Details:</b>	Complaint against arbitrary, excessive and disproportionate increase of Telangana Public Service Commission (TGPSC) application processing fee from Rs. 200/- to Rs. 1,000/- resulting in denial of equal access to substantial number of poor rural public employment opportunities for substantial number of economically disadvantaged unemployed youth and students. The detailed Complaint dated 10.06.2026 is herewith atatched for taking imemddiate cognizance as the complaint has demonstrated a strong prima facie case of flagrant contravention of human rights and the same situation is subsisiting. Hence this complaint in good faith and in lerger public interest.		

**BEFORE THE NATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION OF INDIA::  
AT::: NEW DELHI**

**NHRC CASE NO.: 2026**

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

Complaint against arbitrary, excessive and disproportionate increase of Telangana Public Service Commission (TGPSC) application processing fee from Rs. 200/- to Rs. 1,000/- resulting in denial of equal access to public employment opportunities for substantial number of economically disadvantaged unemployed youth and students.

**COMPLAINANT:**

ADVOCATE YENNAM BALACHANDER REDDY

HYDERABAD, TELANGANA.

AND

**RESPONDENTS** : The following authorities are directly responsible in the said case and pending disposal the case, may be directed to submit time-bound and comprehensive Status reports and Action taken reports (ATRs):

1. State of Telangana, represented by its Chief Secretary, Government of Telangana, Hyderabad.
2. Telangana Public Service Commission (TGPSC), Rep.by Chairman , Hyderabad.
3. General Administration Department, Government of Telangana.
4. Finance Department, Government of Telangana.

**COMPLAINT UNDER SECTION 12 OF THE PROTECTION OF  
HUMAN RIGHTS ACT, 1993**

**MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH:**

**PARTICULARS AND LOCUS STANDI OF THE COMPLAINANT:**

It is most humbly submitted that I am Y.Balachander Reddy, Advocate and human rights defender, having office Hyderabad – Telangana. Hereinafter referred as the Complainant. That the Complainant has abundant locus standi as I had filed various petitions before hon'ble NHRC and different HRCs of States in larger public interest and for advancement of human rights. The Complainant is a public-spirited citizen filing the present case in public interest, with no personal or private motive.

SUM AND SUBSTANCE OF CASE IN A NUTSHELL:

1. It is most humbly submitted that the said complaint is being filed in public interest concerning the decision of the Telangana Public Service Commission (TGPSC) to increase the application processing fee for recruitment notifications from Rs. 200 to Rs. 1,000, representing a 400% increase. The TGPSC recently issued notifications for 222 AEE (Civil) and 49 AEE (Electrical) posts in the Roads and Buildings Department, 19 Assistant Environmental Engineer posts in the Pollution Control Board, and 24 Deputy Education Officer posts in the School Education Department.
2. That the impugned increase affects thousands of unemployed youth and students aspiring for public employment in Telangana. While certain categories may receive partial concessions, a substantial section of candidates, particularly those belonging to economically weaker rural and semi-urban backgrounds, are required to bear the enhanced fee burden.
3. That many rural poor unemployed students and youth depend upon government recruitment examinations as one of the few available avenues for securing stable employment and improving their socio-economic conditions. The exponential increase in application processing fees places a serious financial burden upon such candidates and creates a substantial barrier to participation in public recruitment processes.
4. Government job aspirants generally apply for multiple recruitment notifications because vacancies are released across different departments and services. The recent practice of issuing separate notifications for similar categories of posts further compels candidates to submit multiple applications and pay multiple fees.
5. Consequently, a candidate seeking to compete for several recruitment opportunities may be required to spend several thousands of rupees merely to submit applications, apart from

expenses incurred towards preparation materials, travel, accommodation, examination attendance, and other incidental costs.

6. The impugned fee structure disproportionately affects poor and unemployed candidates who are least capable of bearing such financial burdens and who are the very individuals most dependent upon fair access to public employment opportunities.
7. The Respondents have not publicly disclosed any compelling or proportionate justification demonstrating why the application processing fee required a sudden increase of 400%. In the absence of a transparent rationale, the increase appears arbitrary, excessive, unreasonable, and contrary to the principles governing fair public recruitment.

### **GROUND OF COMPLAINT:**

8. The impugned action is violative of **Article 14 of the Constitution of India**, which prohibits arbitrariness in State action and guarantees equality before law and equal protection of laws.
9. The action adversely affects **Article 16 of the Constitution**, which guarantees equality of opportunity in matters relating to public employment. Public recruitment processes must remain reasonably accessible to all eligible candidates irrespective of their economic status. Excessive and disproportionate application fees operate as a financial barrier that undermines equal opportunity.
10. The Supreme Court has consistently held that arbitrariness is antithetical to equality. Any State action imposing an unreasonable, disproportionate, or exclusionary burden upon citizens is liable to be examined on the touchstone of constitutional fairness and non-arbitrariness.
11. The impugned fee hike disproportionately impacts economically weaker candidates and results in indirect discrimination against poor aspirants who are unable to afford repeated application fees across multiple recruitment notifications.
12. The action is contrary to the constitutional objectives reflected in **Articles 38, 39, 41 and 46**, which require the State to promote social justice, reduce inequalities, protect weaker sections, and work towards securing opportunities for livelihood and employment.

13. Access to public employment opportunities constitutes an important component of socio-economic dignity and livelihood prospects. State actions that unreasonably restrict such access adversely affect the rights and dignity of unemployed youth.
14. Public recruitment examinations conducted by a constitutional recruitment body should facilitate merit-based participation rather than create financial barriers that effectively exclude deserving candidates solely on account of poverty.
15. The impugned increase lacks proportionality, fails the test of reasonableness, and has the practical effect of restricting access to public employment opportunities for a large section of economically vulnerable aspirants.

### **FLAGRANT HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS**

16. The action of the Respondents adversely affects the human dignity, equality, livelihood prospects, and socio-economic rights of unemployed youth and students.
17. By creating a significant financial barrier to participation in recruitment examinations, the Respondents have effectively restricted equal access to opportunities that are intended to be available to all eligible citizens on a fair and non-discriminatory basis.
18. The burden imposed by the impugned fee structure falls most heavily upon rural poor students, unemployed graduates, first-generation learners, and economically disadvantaged sections of society, thereby deepening existing inequalities.
19. Such exclusionary measures are inconsistent with constitutional principles, social justice objectives, and the human rights framework protecting equality, dignity, and fair access to public opportunities. Hence this complaint in good faith and in larger public interest.

### **RESEARCH OF COMPLAINANT:**

The **Telangana State Public Service Commission (TSPSC)** was constituted on **8 August 2014** through GO Ms. No. 43 following the formation of Telangana State on **2 June 2014** under the Andhra Pradesh Reorganisation Act, 2014. As the youngest Public Service Commission in India, TSPSC inherited a rich legacy of public service recruitment that dates back over 150 years to the erstwhile Hyderabad State. Its primary role is to conduct recruitment and selection for government posts in Telangana under the provisions of Articles 315 and 320 of the Constitution of India. The first Chairman of TSPSC was Prof. Ghanta Chakrapani, appointed on 17 December 2014.

The origins of this recruitment system can be traced to the reforms introduced during the rule of the Nizams of Hyderabad. Modern civil service administration began under Sir Salar Jung I, who established administrative reforms and promoted merit-based recruitment. The **Hyderabad Civil Service Committee** was created in 1919 to conduct examinations and manage civil services, and later the **Hyderabad Public Service Commission** was established on 27 April 1947 by a Firman of the Nizam, modeled on the British Provincial Public Service Commissions. After Hyderabad's integration into India and the formation of Andhra Pradesh in 1956, the commission merged with the **Andhra Pradesh Public Service Commission**, until Telangana's formation led to the creation of TSPSC as an independent constitutional body.

**PRIMA-FACIE CASE:** In the light of the above it is most humbly submitted that the said Complaint has strong prima-facie case.

**LIMITATION:** The said case has running cause of action and is filed within the limitation period.

**DECLARATION:** The Complainant in good faith declares that this matter is not pending before any State HRC or any other court or authority and that the information provided is based on publicly available reports and credible data.

**INTERIM RELIEF:** Pending final disposal of this complaint, it is prayed that this Hon'ble Commission may issue interim advisories to all Respondents.

**PRAYER:**

The Complainant most respectfully prays that PENDING DISPOSAL OF THE CASE, the Hon'ble National Human Rights Commission may be pleased to immediately take cognizance of the matter under the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993.

A) Call for a detailed report from all Respondents regarding the rationale, financial basis, and decision-making process leading to the increase of the application processing fee from Rs. 200 to Rs. 1,000;

B) Examine whether the impugned fee structure is arbitrary, disproportionate, discriminatory, and violative of constitutional guarantees of equality and equal opportunity in public employment;

- C) Recommend immediate review and suspension of the enhanced application processing fee pending such examination;
- D) Recommend restoration of a reasonable, affordable, and non-exclusionary fee structure that ensures meaningful access to recruitment opportunities for economically weaker candidates;
- E) Recommend formulation of transparent guidelines governing recruitment-related fees to ensure compliance with constitutional principles of fairness, proportionality, accessibility, and non-discrimination;
- F) Pass such further orders, recommendations, or directions as may be deemed fit in the interests of justice, protection of human rights, and safeguarding equal access to public employment opportunities.

FILED BY:

*ADVOCATE YENNAM BALACHANDER REDDY*

*FILING DATE: 10.06.2026*