

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03.11.2015

CORAM :

The Hon'ble MR.SANJAY KISHAN KAUL, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

The Hon'ble MRS.JUSTICE PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA

W.P. No.22898 of 2015

S.Kumaramuthu

.. Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Secretary to Govt.,
Home (Police II) Dept.,
Fort St. George, Chennai.

2.The Secretary to Govt.,
P & AR Dept.,
Fort St. George, Chennai.

3.The Director General of Police,
Mylapore, Chennai.

4.The Chairman,
T.N. Uniformed Services Recruitment
Board, Anna Salai, Chennai.

.. Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issue of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 18.7.15 (Enrolment No.1121242) and quash the same, in so far as denying him to participate in the next stage of selection and seeking direction to the respondents to earmark separate mark under the priority quota as per Clause 6 (e) of prospectus earmarking 20% for persons studied in Tamil medium for selection to the post of Sub-Inspector of Police (M) for the year 2015 forthwith, and consider the claim of the petitioner for appointment under PSTM quota and grant him all consequential service and monetary benefits.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Venkatramani, S.C.
For Mr.M.Muthappan

For Respondents : Mr.P.H.Aravindh Pandian,
Addl. Adv. General, assisted by
Mr.S.T.S.Murthi, Govt. Pleader

O R D E R
(Order of the Court was made by The Hon'ble Chief Justice)

The issue of the petitioner being considered as a candidate for recruitment to the post of Sub-Inspector in pursuance to the notification dated 08.02.2015 under the category of having studied in Tamil Medium at school level has now been decided against such similar candidates in view of our order in W.P.No.27005 of 2015 (between D.Anbarasan and The Secretary to Govt., and others) decided on 08.09.2015.

2.Learned senior counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that in that eventuality, the petitioner case can at least be covered in the open quota, something which learned Additional Advocate General accepts. However, when the facts of the case are analysed, the difficulty is that the petitioner does not make the minimum benchmark for the open quota in the written examination having obtained 49 marks against the cut-off marks of 49.50. Thus, even if the petitioner is considered under the open quota, he would not be eligible.

3.Writ petition, thus, must fail and is, accordingly, dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar (CS IV)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

sra
To

1.The Secretary to Govt.,
Home (Police II) Dept.,
Fort St. George, Chennai.

2.The Secretary to Govt.,
P & AR Dept.,
Fort St. George, Chennai.

3.The Director General of Police,
Mylapore, Chennai.

4.The Chairman,
T.N. Uniformed Services Recruitment
Board, Anna Salai, Chennai.
+1 cc to Mr.M.Muthappan, Advocate, sr.60401
+1 cc to the Government Pleader, sr.61173

W.P.No.22898 of 2015

ev co
kra 16/11/2015