



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.08.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE KRISHNASWAMY GOVINDARAJAN

W.P.No.32615 of 2016

S.Ramesh

..Petitioner(s)

Vs.

The District Collector (PD Section),
Tirupur District,
Tirupur.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records bearing Na.Ka.No.4663/2014/V1 dated 08.07.2014 of the respondent herein and quash the same and further direct the respondent to grant selection grade to the petitioner in the cadre of extension officer (since abolished) from 05.11.2007 with all consequential benefits such as refixation of pay etc.

For Petitioner(s) : Mr.R.Rajmohan
for Ms.T.Hemalatha

For Respondent(s) : Ms.R.K.Sekina Reshma,
Additional Government Pleader



WEB COPY



ORDER

This Writ petition has been filed seeking the following relief:-

“calling for the records bearing Na.Ka.No.4663/2014/V1 dated 08.07.2014 of the respondent herein and quash the same and further direct the respondent to grant selection grade to the petitioner in the cadre of extension officer (since abolished) from 05.11.2007 with all consequential benefits such as refixation of pay etc.”

2. The brief facts of the case are as follows:-

2.1 The petitioner was initially appointed as a Junior Assistant on 24.11.1984 and was subsequently promoted to the post of Assistant on 04.11.1987. Upon completion of ten years of service in the promotional post, the petitioner was granted Selection Grade in the cadre of Assistant with effect from 04.11.1997. Thereafter, the petitioner was promoted to the post of Extension Officer in August 2003. Consequent upon the abolition of the said post in the year 2008 and its subsequent merger with the higher post of Deputy Block Development Officer, the petitioner was moved to the position of Deputy Block Development Officer and eventually as a Block Development Officer.

2.2 It is the case of the petitioner that since the scale of pay of a Selection Grade Assistant is identical to the ordinary scale of pay of an Extension Officer, the services rendered by him both as a Selection Grade Assistant and in the ordinary scale of pay as an Extension Officer ought to be clubbed together for



the purpose of granting Selection Grade in the post of Extension Officer. In this regard, the petitioner submitted a representation dated 14.03.2008 to the District Collector, Coimbatore. During the pendency of the said representation, following the bifurcation of the District, the petitioner was transferred and posted to Tirupur District at his own request.

2.3 Seeking the identical relief of regularizing his Selection Grade in the post of Extension Officer with effect from 05.11.2007, the petitioner submitted a representation dated 14.05.2014 to the respondent. However, the respondent, *vide* the impugned order dated 08.07.2014, rejected the petitioner's request. Aggrieved by the said order of rejection, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of the present Writ Petition.

3. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

4. The primary contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner's pay was erroneously fixed, and his legitimate request for re-fixation was summarily turned down by the respondent, *vide* the impugned order. The major grievance of the petitioner is that the impugned order is a non-speaking one, completely bereft of any valid reasoning or explanation to justify the rejection of his claim.



5. Per contra, the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondent submitted that the grounds for rejecting the petitioner's request have been explicitly stated in the counter-affidavit filed by the respondent. It is argued that the petitioner is ineligible for any such re-fixation of pay and thus, the writ petition deserves to be dismissed.

6. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions. A bare perusal of the materials on record, particularly the impugned order dated 08.07.2014, validates the stand taken by the petitioner. No specific reason or independent application of mind is discernible from the face of the impugned order. It is a cryptic, single-line rejection that merely places reliance on a circular letter dated 09.08.2011, without explaining its applicability to the facts of the case.

7. It is trite law that an administrative order impacting the service benefits of an employee must be reasoned. Therefore, the impugned order is wholly unsustainable in law and accordingly, the impugned rejection order dated 08.07.2014 passed by the respondent is hereby set aside and the matter is remitted back to the respondent, who shall reconsider the petitioner's claim de novo on its own merits and pass a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law, after affording a fair opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner.



WEB COPY

8. With the above directions and observations, this Writ Petition stands disposed of. No costs.

19.08.2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

skt

To:

The District Collector (PD Section),
Tirupur District,
Tirupur.



WEB COPY

W.P.No.32615 of 2



KRISHNASWAMY GOVINDARAJAN, J.

skt

W.P.No.32615 of 2016

19.08.2026