WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09-07-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

W.A.Nos.3589 and 3607 of 2025 AND
C.M.P.Nos.29531, 29533, 29743 and 29744 of 2025

W.A.No.3589 of 2025

1. C.Venkatesan
2. M.Anbazhagan

..Appellants

-vs-

1. R.Karthikeyan
2. V.Mariappan
3. K.Gopinath
4. G.Thayalan
5. M.Eranian
6. Meenakshisundaram
7. T.Thirunavukkarasu

8. State of Tamil Nadu
   Rep. by its Secretary to Govt.,
   Home Department,
   The Secretariat Chennai 09

9. The Director General of Police
   Dr.Radhakrishnan Road,
   Mylapore, Chennai 04

10. A.Arun
11. G.Karthik
12. A.Arun
13. S.Ameer ali Jinna
14. U.M.Avinash
15. R.Stephen Vinodh

16. S.Madhan Kumar

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

17.Chelladurai
18.R.Tamilselvi
19.J.Deepa
20.Manoj Kumar
21.G.Gopal
22.Manoj M.T
23.C.Manjula
24.C.Madhavi
25.S.Elavarasi

(R23 to R25 impleaded as per order dated 06.01.2026)

26.S.Shunmugasundaram
27.R.R. Venkatesan
28.N.Maharajan
29.D.Augustin
30.M.Ranjith
31.V.Dilipkumar
32.C.Kanagaraj
33.Ramakrishnan
34.R.Manjula Devi
35.P.Vijayakumar
36.R.Meena
37.K.Madhavan

(R26 to R37 impleaded as per order dated 28.01.2026)

38.S.Suresh
39.P.Samuthirakani
40.G.Gopinath
41.P.Ravindran

(R38 to R41 impleaded as per order dated 28.01.2026)

42.M.Jayalakshmi
43.V.Ananthi
44.R.Rajarajeswari

(R42 to R44 impleaded as per order dated 28.01.2026)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

45.M.Venugopal
46.P.Premkumar
47.M.Mukunthan
48.D.Manojkumar

(R45 to R48 impleaded as per order dated 28.01.2026)

49.S.Sathishkumar
50.G.Ponthilakraj
51.G.Vignesh Guru
52.S.Mani

(R49 to R52 impleaded as per order dated 28.01.2026)

53.R.Ramachandran
54.P.Shanthi
55.S.Mohandoss
56.S.Kanagaraj

(R53 to R56 impleaded as per order dated 28.01.2026)

57.G.Manikumar
58.C.A.Kesavan
59.K.Karuppasamy Pandian
60.R.Nandhakumar
61.D.Premkumar
62.B.Agilan Raj

(R57 to R62 impleaded as per order dated 09.07.2026)

63.P.B.Theerthagiri
64.A.Manimekalai
65.P.Parthiban
66.K.Prithika Yashini
67.M.Karthikeyan
68.M.P.Dinesh Kumar
69.V.Dinesh
70.G.Selvakumar
71.D.Diwan Mydheen

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

72. J.Ganesan
73. M.Selvakumar
74. M.Balasubramaniyan
75. S.Raja
76. R.Ramasamy
77. S.Ranjith
78. M.Rajkamal
79. A.Harun Ersath
80. K.R.Kumar
81. K.Marimuthu
82. Lavanya G

(R63 to R82 impleaded as per order dated 09.07.2026)

… Respondents

W.A.No.3607 of 2025

1. R.Karthikeyan
2. V.Mariappan
3. K.Gopinath
4. G.Thayalan
5. M.Eraninan
6. M.Meenakshisundaram
7. T.Thirunavukkarasu

… Appellants

-vs-

1. State of Tamil Nadu
   Rep. by its Secretary to Govt.,
   Home Department,
   The Secretariat, Chennai 09

2. The Director General of Police
   Dr.Radhakrishnan Road,
   Mylapore, Chennai 4.
3. A.Arun
4. G.Karthik
5. A.Arun
6. S.Ameer Ali Jinna
7. U.M.Avinash
8. R.Stephen Vinodh
9. S.Madhan Kumar
10. M.Chelladurai

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

11. R.Tamilselvi
12. J.Deepa
13. Manojkumar
14. G.Gopal
15. M.T.Manoj
16. C.Venkatesan
17. M.Anbazhagan
18. S.Shunmugasundaram
19. R.R.Venkatesan
20. N.Maharajan
21. D.Augustin
22. M.Ranjith
23. V.Dilipkumar
24. C.Kanagaraj
25. Ramakrishnan
26. R.Manjula Devi
27. P.Vijayakumar
28. R.Meena
29. K.Madhavan

(R18 to R29 impleaded as per order dated 28.01.2026)

30. M.Jayalakshmi
31. V.Ananthi
32. R.Rajarajeswari

(R30 to R32 impleaded as per order dated 28.01.2026)

33. N.Prabhakaran
34. V.Jagadeesan
35. S.Manikandan
36. M.Santhana Bose
37. K.Ganapathy
38. A.Vimal Nathan,
39. M.Santhosh Kumar
40. N.Karthick
41. P.Muthumari Deventhirar
42. D.Rajiv Gandhi
43. Suresh Pandian
44. G.Jeya Pandi
45. C.Madhavi
46. R.Kanagavalli
47. M.Kamatchi

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

48. K.Karthigai Selvi
49. V.Jothi Lakshmi
50. M.Benazir Begum

(R33 to R50 impleaded as per order dated 09.07.2026)

… Respondents

W.A.No.3589 of 2025

Prayer: To set aide the order dated 19.11.2925 passed by the learned Judge of this Hon'ble Court in W.P.No.39119 of 2025.

W.A.No.3607 of 2025

Prayer: To set aside the order passed in W.P.No.39119 of 2025 dated 19.11.2025 by allowing the Writ Appeal.

Case No.	For Appellants	For Respondents
W.A.No.3589 of 2025	Mr.Naveen Kumar Murthy For Ms.S.Varsha	Mr.T.Gowthaman, AAG for R8 & R9 Mr.R.Prathapkumar for R10 Mr.C.Jayavel for R18 & R19 Mr.K.Venkat Ramani, Senior Counsel For M.Muthappan For R11 to 16, 26 to 37 & R57 to 62 Mr.MA.Gowthaman For R23 to 25 Mr.Ravi For R38 to 41 Ms.Jayanthi K.Shan For R42 to 44 Mr.L.Chandrakumar For R45 to 48 Mr.Balan Haridas For R49 to 52 Mr.S.T.S.Murthy, Senior Counsel For Mr.Veerapandian For R53 to 56 Mr.Aditya B.Sarangarajan For R63 to 82
W.A.No.3607 of 2025	Mrs.Dakshyani Reddy, Senior Counsel For Mr.K.Sathish Kumar	Mr.T.Gowthaman, AAG for R1 & R2 Mr.K.Venkat Ramani, Senior Counsel For M.Muthappan For R3, 4, 18 to 29 & 33 to 50 Ms.Jayanthi K.Shan For R30 to 32

*****

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

COMMON JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by S.M.Subramaniam,J.)

Under assail is the Writ Order dated 19.11.2025 passed in W.P.No.39119 of 2025. Writ Petitioners are appellants in the present Intra Court Appeals instituted under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent.

2. Dispute raised is regarding fixation of seniority amongst Sub-Inspectors of Police initially appointed in Taluk Police Wing (TPW) and Armed Reserve Wing (ARW). It is not in dispute that all Sub-Inspectors of Police involved in the present *lis* were recruited in a common recruitment made in pursuance of Recruitment Notification No.110 dated 01.04.2010.

3. On the side of Appellants, it is contended that on their transfer from ARW to TPW, their seniority is to be fixed taking into consideration the marks obtained by them in the initial recruitment process conducted in the year 2010. As per the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Ranjit Singh and Others vs. State of Tamil Nadu and Others***[1], seniority is to be fixed based on the marks

[1]2025 INSC 612

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

obtained by candidates in the examination, on the basis of which, they have been recruited to service. Applying the ratio laid down by Apex Court in ***Ranjith Singh's case*** (supra), seniority of transferees, transferred from ARW to TPW is to be fixed and consequently, their promotions to the post of Sub-Inspector of Police are to be considered. It is further contended that at the time of transfer of these Armed Reserve Sub-Inspectors (ARSIs), it is stated by the Government that seniority will be fixed under Rule 25(b) of Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Police Subordinate Service Rules (in short 'TNPSS Rules'). Rule 25(b) of the TNPSS Rules states that transfer of a person from one class or category of service to another carrying the same pay scale shall not be treated as "first appointment" to the latter for seniority purposes. Therefore, original marks obtained by Sub-Inspectors of Police at the time of their initial recruitment is to be taken into consideration for fixation of seniority on their transfer from ARW to TPW.

4. Contesting respondents, currently serving in TPW would oppose, by stating that marks obtained in the recruitment process in the year 2010 was considered along with the option exercised by selected candidates. Accordingly, selected candidates were either posted in ARW or TPW. After joining duty either in ARW or TPW, separate seniority list for both Wings have been drawn and being maintained for grant of

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

promotion and other benefits within the Wing. The said Wing-wise seniority in the present case has been followed for the past about 10 years. Armed Reserve Sub-Inspectors (ARSIs) submitted representations seeking transfer to TPW. Thus, based on their option, they have been transferred to TPW. On such transfer, ARSIs have foregone their initial ranking list prepared at the time of direct recruitment to the post of Sub-Inspector. Thus, mark based ranking along with the option was considered at the time of initial recruitment for the purpose of posting selected candidates to ARW and TPW. Therefore, the ratio laid down in Ranjith Singh's case (supra) has no 9application for the reason that Hon'ble Supreme Court considered fixation of seniority amongst recruitees at the initial stage in the said case. In the present case, dispute arose on transfer of serving Sub-Inspectors from ARW to TPW. Therefore, the seniority is to be fixed based on Rule 25(a) of TNPSS Rules.

5. Learned Additional Advocate General appearing on behalf of State would reiterate, by stating that dispute in the present case is about fixation of seniority amongst Sub-Inspectors, who all are already working as Sub-Inspectors in ARW and TPW. It is not about fixation of seniority in the initial recruitment. Thus, ratio laid down in ***Ranjith Singh's case*** (supra) cannot be applied. In the present case,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Department has to apply Rule 25(a) of TNPSS Rules. Accordingly, transferred ARSIs ought to be placed below Sub-Inspectors, who all are already serving in TPW.

6. This Court has considered rival submissions made between parties to the *lis*.

7. Applicability of Rule for fixation of seniority is to be considered in the present case. Uncontroverted facts between parties are that all Sub-Inspectors involved in the present dispute relating to seniority were recruited in the year 2010, pursuant to the Recruitment Notification No.110 dated 01.04.2010. A perusal of Notification would show that at the time of initial Direct Recruitment to the post of Sub-Inspectors, marks obtained by selected candidates along with preference (option) exercised by them would be considered. Accordingly, they would be posted either as ARSIs or TSIs. On issuance of appointment orders, they are accordingly posted and serving in their respective Wings and their seniority is maintained separately. After serving about 10 years, ARSIs expressed their willingness to serve as TSIs. Government considered their request and transferred them as TSIs.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

8. In G.O.Ms.No.446, Home dated 27.05.2003, Government stated that seniority of transferee ARSIs in the post of TSIs shall be fixed with reference to the provisions contained in Rule 25(b) of TNPSS Rules. Relying on the said Government Order, Appellants would submit that their seniority is to be fixed based on the marks obtained in the initial recruitment. In this context, it is relevant to consider the scope of Rule 25(b) and Rule 25 (a) of TNPSS Rules and its applicability. Rule 25(a) and Second Proviso to Rule 25(a) reads as under:

> "25 (a) The seniority of a person in any class or category of the service shall, unless he has been reduced to a lower rank as a punishment, be determined by the rank obtained by him in the list of approved candidates drawn up by the appointing authority, subject to the rule of reservation where it applies. The date of commencement of his probation shall be the date on which he joins duty irrespective of his seniority, unless he has been appointed temporarily under sub rule (d) of Rule 10 or sub rule (b) of Rule 15, as the case may be.
> ******
> Provided further that in the case of Sub-Inspectors appointed by transfer from Sub-Inspectors (Armed Reserve) in category 5, in class I of these Rules or by recruitment by transfer from Sub-Inspectors in category 2 in rule 3 of the Tamil Nadu Special Police Subordinate Service Rules, 1978 as the case ,may be, irrespective of their actual date of such appointment. Seniority shall be fixed below the direct recruits in which they were recruited to their respective feeder categories."

9. What was set aside by Apex Court in ***Ranjith Singh's case*** is Sixth Proviso to Rule 25(a) of TNPSS Rules issued in

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

G.O.Ms.No.868 Home (Police VI) Department dated 21.11.2017. Therefore, Rule 25(a) and Second Proviso to Rule 25(a) is not connected with the judgment in ***Ranjith Singh's case***, where seniority amongst initially directly recruited candidates alone was considered and not the seniority in respect of Sub-Inspectors, who all are transferred from ARW to TPW. Rule 25(b) of TNPSS Rules reads as under:

> "(b) The transfer of a person from one class or category of the services to another class or category carrying the same pay or scale of pay shall not be treated as first appointment to the latter for purpose of seniority, and the seniority of a person so transferred shall be determined with reference to the date of his first appointment to the class or category from which he was transferred. Where any difficulty or doubt arises in applying this sub rule, seniority shall be determined by the appointing authority."

10. A close reading of Rule 25(b) would show that it is all about fixation of seniority amongst transferee Sub-Inspectors. In other words, seniority amongst Sub-Inspectors either in ARW or in TPW. Thus, Rule 25(b) has no application in respect of Sub-Inspectors transferred from ARW to TPW. Therefore, in respect of transfers made from ARW to TPW, Rule 25(a) and Second Proviso would be applicable.

11. Second Proviso to Rule 25(a) of TNPSS Rules in unambiguous terms, states that irrespective of their actual date of appointment, seniority shall be fixed below direct recruitees in which they were recruited in respective feeder categories. Therefore, it is all

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

about fixation of seniority between two different wings, where different kinds of Police training are provided. Sub-Inspectors appointed in ARW are provided with separate training programme and Sub-Inspectors initially appointed in TPW are imparted separate Police training. When, at the willingness of Sub-Inspectors working in ARW, transfer was effected to TPW as Sub-Inspectors, their seniority is to be fixed below Sub-Inspectors serving in TPW, who all are already working there and their seniority became settled. In other words, transferee Sub-Inspectors from ARW are to be placed below Sub-Inspectors, who are all recruited and posted initially in TPW. There is no inter-se dispute amongst Sub-Inspectors appointed in ARW or TPW. Seniority dispute in the present case is all about fixation of seniority of transferee Sub-Inspectors on their transfer to TPW. Therefore, question of considering initial marks obtained by candidates in the common recruitment may not arise at all.

12. Once marks and option exercised are considered at the time of initial recruitment in the year 2010 and after their appointment at their choice to different wings, separate seniority is maintained and after serving about 10 years, further willingness is given to post them as TSIs, and on such transfer, Rule 25(a) Second Proviso is to be applied. Therefore, ARSIs, on their transfer to TPW are to be placed below TSIs, who all are serving in the Department from the date of their initial date of

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

recruitment from the year 2010. In other words, seniority of TSIs shall remain undisturbed and transferred ARSIs are to be placed below TSIs.

13. Learned Single Judge in the Writ Order impugned also considered the fact that ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Ranjith Singh's case*** has no application to the facts of the present case relating to fixation of seniority amongst transferee ARSIs and TSIs.

14. In view of the facts and circumstances, this Court could be able to arrive at an irresistible conclusion that finding given by Writ Court in the impugned order is in consonance with Rule relating to seniority applicable for the post of Sub-Inspector of Police in respect of two different Wings, namely ARW and TPW. Thus, Writ Order stands confirmed. Consequently, ***the present Writ Appeals are dismissed***.

15. At this juncture, it is brought to the notice of this Court that ARSIs, who were already transferred to TPW have not yet been placed in the seniority list at all.

16. In view of the above submission, Department is directed to ensure that seniority of Armed Reserve Sub-Inspectors (ARSIs) is fixed in accordance with Rule 25(a) and Second Proviso of TNPSS

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Rules. Accordingly, their promotions are to be considered, as and when their turn comes. No costs. Connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

(S.M.S.,J.) (N.S.,J.)
09-07-2026

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

To:

1. The Secretary to Government,
   State of Tamil Nadu
   Home Department,
   Fort St.George,
   Chennai – 600 009.

2. The Director General of Police
   Dr.Radhakrishnan Road,
   Mylapore, Chennai 04

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.
AND
N.SENTHILKUMAR,J.
AR

W.A.Nos.3589 and 3607 of 2025
2/2

09-07-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis