



W.P.(MD) No.13535 of 2026

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 23.07.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR

W.P.(MD) No.13535 of 2026

C.Theneeswaran

... Petitioner

-VS-

1.The Engineer-in-Chief and
Chief Engineer (General)
Water Resources Department
Chepauk
Chennai-600 005

2.The Chief Engineer
State Ground and Surface
Water Resources Data Centre
Taramani
Chennai-600 113

3.The Executive Engineer
Water Resources Department
Ground Water Division
Trichy-20

... Respondents



W.P.(MD) No.13535 of 2026

WEB COPY **PRAYER:** Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of mandamus directing the first respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 20.01.2026 and provide compassionate appointment to petitioner in the light of the first respondent's letter No.S4(2)/43653/2021, dated 16.12.2021 and the order in W.A.(MD) No.479 of 2024, dated 01.04.2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Thirumal

For Respondents : Mr.C.Jeganathan
Counsel for the Government of Tamil Nadu

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed seeking a writ of mandamus directing the first respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 20.01.2026 and provide him compassionate appointment.

2. The petitioner claims that his father, while working as an Irrigation Assistant, passed away on 02.03.2001 and accordingly, the mother of the petitioner stated to have submitted an application seeking compassionate appointment to the petitioner, who was a minor by then.



W.P.(MD) No.13535 of 2026

WEB COPY

3. In response to the notice issued by this Court, the respondents have filed their counter-affidavit contending that the petitioner, on an earlier occasion, filed a writ petition in W.P.(MD) No.22547 of 2021 seeking an identical relief to provide him appointment on compassionate grounds and the said writ petition was dismissed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court on 07.03.2022 and the writ appeal in W.A.(MD) No.1901 of 2025 filed against the said order dated 07.03.2022 was also dismissed by a learned Division Bench of this Court *vide* Judgment dated 16.07.2025. It is further stated that the petitioner, suppressing the earlier round of litigation, has filed the present writ petition seeking a very same relief. Thus, it is contended that this writ petition being the second round of litigation seeking a very same relief cannot be entertained.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the earlier writ petition was dismissed by this Court on the ground that the father of the petitioner was only an NMR employee and therefore, the Scheme of Compassionate Appointment has no application to the NMR employees and hence, the petitioner is not entitled for compassionate appointment. He further contended that the true facts were not brought to



W.P.(MD) No.13535 of 2026

WEB COPY

the notice of this Court by the respondents, when the earlier writ petition was dismissed. As a matter of fact, the services of the petitioner's father were regularized *vide* G.O.(Ms) No.334, Public Works (C2) Department, dated 19.10.2007, and the said fact was not brought to the notice of this Court and therefore, the earlier writ petition was dismissed.

5. Whatever be the reason, the petitioner ought to have disclosed about the earlier round of litigation and the orders passed thereon by this Court in the affidavit filed in support of the present writ petition. But, for the reasons best known, the petitioner has suppressed the same in the affidavit and filed the present writ petition.

6. In the light of the order passed by this Court in the earlier round of litigation, the present writ petition seeking the identical relief cannot be entertained. If at all the petitioner is of the view that the order passed in the earlier round of litigation is because of non-disclosure of the crucial facts or as a result of suppression of facts etc., it is open for him to take appropriate steps by seeking review of the orders passed in the earlier round of litigation. But, under no circumstances, the same can be by way of filing a fresh writ petition. This Court, having declined the relief sought by the petitioner in the



W.P.(MD) No.13535 of 2026

WEB COPY

earlier round of litigation, cannot entertain the present writ petition seeking the very same relief.

7. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed leaving it open to the petitioner to pursue the remedies that are open to him, including filing of an application seeking review of the orders passed in the earlier writ petition or writ appeal, in accordance with law. No costs.

23.07.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No

krk

To:

- 1.The Engineer-in-Chief and
Chief Engineer (General),
Water Resources Department,
Chepauk, Chennai-600 005.
- 2.The Chief Engineer,
State Ground and Surface,
Water Resources Data Centre,
Taramani, Chennai-600 113.
- 3.The Executive Engineer,
Water Resources Department,
Ground Water Division, Trichy-20.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.13535 of 2026

MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR, J.

krk

W.P.(MD) No.13535 of 2026

23.07.2026

Page 6 of 6