

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.08.2016

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE B. RAJENDRAN

Writ Petition No. 18032 of 2016

--

K. Mohanraj

.. Petitioner

-Versus-

1. The Principal Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Secretariat
Chennai - 600 009
 2. The Chief Engineer (General)
Public Works Department
Kamarajar Salai
Chennai
 3. The Principal Secretary to Government
Personnel & Administrative Reforms Department
Secretariat
Chennai - 600 009
- ... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying for a Writ of Mandamus directing the first respondent to fill the existing vacancies to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular), Public Works Department, as per the panel notified by the first respondent in G.O. No.9, dated 06.01.2016 and to appoint the petitioner as a Chief Engineer (General).

For Petitioner : Mr. V. Raghavachari
for Mr. R. Syed Mustafa

For Respondents : Mr. P.H. Aravindh Pandian
Additional Advocate General
assisted by Mr. A. Kumar
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

The petitioner has come forward with this writ petition praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the first respondent to fill up the existing vacancy to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular), Public Works Department, as per the panel notified by the first respondent in G.O. No.9, dated 06.01.2016 and to appoint him as Chief Engineer (General).

on 24.06.1981. After successive promotions, the petitioner is working as Superintending Engineer on 07.11.2013. The next avenue of promotion is to the post of Chief Engineer who shall be the head of the department. According to the petitioner, on 06.01.2016, a panel was drawn by the first respondent in which those who are eligible for promotion to the post of Chief Engineer from among the Superintending Engineers was drawn in which his name was also included.

(ii) It is the grievance of the petitioner that as per GO Ms. No.440, Personnel and Administrative Reforms Department dated 26.10.1990, the minimum period of left over service to hold the post of Head of Department has been prescribed. As per which, an officer should have not less than one year minimum period of service before his or retirement and for those who do not have minimum period of left over service of one year but otherwise found to be fully qualified and fit for promotion as head of department, such officer shall be appointed as Officer on Special Duty with a special assignment, of course with the same scale of pay as paid to the head of the department. This designation of Officer on Special Duty, according to the petitioner, has been changed as Special Chief Engineer by virtue of GO Ms. No.631 dated 23.10.1997.

(iii) The petitioner would contend that as per GO Ms. No.440 dated 26.10.1990 and GO Ms. No.631 dated 23.10.1997, the crucial date of one year left over service is the date of preparation of panel/approval and it is on such consideration, the panel for the year 2015-2016 was drawn and approved by the first respondent. While preparing the panel, it was estimated that there are 7 vacancies required to be filled up to the post of Chief Engineer. In the panel, 6 of the senior most Superintending Engineers, who were included, were not having one year left over service but found fit for promotion. The other seven persons in the panel were having one year left over service on the date of preparation of panel and he was also found fit for promotion to the post of Chief Engineer (regular). According to the petitioner, prior to the preparation and approval of the panel dated 06.01.2016, the first respondent approved the number of estimated vacancies for the post of Chief Engineer for the year 2015-2016 as seven vide GO (D) No.298, Public Works Department dated 13.10.2015 and it was also referred to in the panel drawn on 06.01.2016. In the panel, the name of the petitioner was included in serial No.11 as he was found fit to hold the post of Chief Engineer (Regular). According to the petitioner, even though in the combined list of Special Chief Engineer and Chief Engineer (regular) he was included in serial No.11, he is the fifth in rank eligible for promotion to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular) out of the seven estimated vacancies. However, for the reasons best known, only three of the Superintendents were promoted as Chief Engineer (Regular) by the respondents by issuing GO (d) dated 23.02.2016. The petitioner was under the bonafide impression that since he is eligible for promotion to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular) he will be promoted in the existing vacancies as per G.O. (D) No.9 dated 06.01.2016.

While the petitioner was anticipating for such promotion, the first respondent promoted one S. Dinakaran, Superintending Engineer to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular) on 30.04.2016. In the meantime, two more post of Chief Engineer (Regular) have arisen vacant on 30.04.2016 consequent to the retirement of the (i) Engineer-in-Chief (Buildings) and Chief Engineer (Buildings), Chennai Region and (ii) Chief Engineer, WRD, PWD, Trichy Region. Thus, apart from the seven estimated vacancies, two more vacancies have arisen subsequently in which also the petitioner was not considered.

(iv) According to the petitioner, he reliably learnt that his juniors are sought to be promoted to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular) and if his juniors were given such promotion, then automatically he will fall under the category of Special Chief Engineer. According to the petitioner, if his juniors are promoted to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular), then, as a Special Chief Engineer he has to work under those who are promoted to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular). The petitioner has not been promoted to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular) deliberately and any delay in considering his claim will jeopardise him from getting promotion to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular). As on the crucial date of one year of his left over service, there was a vacancy to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular) but for the reasons best known, it was not filled up by the respondents. Even on earlier occasions, those who are holding the post of Superintending Engineers and who are not having one year of left over service were promoted to the post of Chief Engineer, however, such a claim made by the petitioner has not been considered. The petitioner has submitted a representation dated 04.05.2016 requesting the respondents to promote him to the post of Chief Engineer (Regular) in the existing vacancy as per the panel dated 06.01.2016, however, there was no semblance of consideration which resulted in the petitioner approaching this Court with this writ petition.

3. Mr. V. Raghavachari, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would contend that even as on the date of filing the writ petition, there were posts lying vacant, but the petitioner was not promoted in such vacant posts. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner ought to have been promoted on 23.02.2016, the date on which a vacancy arose. Even subsequently on 30.04.2016, vacancies arose, but the petitioner was not given promotion. Now, the respondents are attempting to give promotion to the petitioner. According to the learned counsel for the petitioner, the crucial date of left over service has to be taken into account only from the date of preparation of the panel and not the issuance of posting order. The respondents ought to have considered the claim of the petitioner for promotion on 28.02.2016, the date on which he becomes eligible, taking into consideration his age of retirement on 28.02.2017 especially when there is no embargo to confer him promotion. The name of the petitioner was also included in the combined list of panel for promotion drawn on 06.01.2016. The learned counsel for the petitioner further

submits that without giving effect to the panel drawn for the year 2015-2016 in which the petitioner's name is included, the respondents are attempting to draw a fresh panel for the year 2016-2017 whereby the petitioner's claim for promotion will be defeated indirectly.

4. Opposing the writ petition, a counter affidavit has been filed by the first respondent. Relying on the counter affidavit, Mr. Aravindh Pandian, learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents would contend that the Government has approved the estimated vacancies for the post of Chief Engineer in Public Works Department for the year 2015-2016 as seven by issuing GO (D) No.298, Public Works (A1) Department dated 13.10.2015 taking into account the total number of permanent/temporary posts, anticipated vacancies due to retirement, promotion etc., between 01.04.2015 and 31.03.2016. Further, as per G.O. (D) No.43, Public Works (A2) Department dated 23.02.2016 and G.O. (D) No. 141, Public Works Department dated 30.06.2016, the Government ordered to confer promotion to the post of Chief Engineer/Special Chief Engineer upto serial No.7 in the panel. Based on such orders, posting orders were issued against the retirement vacancies of Chief Engineers till February 2016. According to the learned Additional Advocate General, there was no retirement of Chief Engineer in public works department during the month of March 2016 and the vacancy of Chief Engineer at the end of 31.03.2016 is 'nil'. As on 30.04.2016, when two vacancies in the post of Chief Engineer in Public Works Department arose due to the retirement of Thiru. S. Sampath and Thiru. S. Asokan the claim of the petitioner for such promotion, who was in serial No.11 of the panel, was taken into consideration. However, the petitioner does not have the requisite minimum period of one year of left over service before retirement inasmuch as the petitioner reaches the age of retirement on 28.02.2017. Therefore, he was found to be not eligible for promotion as Regular Chief Engineer. As per Rule 5 under Branch -1 (Public Works) of the Special Rules for the Tamil Nadu Engineering Services as amended in G.O. (Ms) No.245, Public Works (A2) Department, dated 08.08.2007. The petitioner was found to be eligible only for promotion to the post of Special Chief Engineer. Therefore, Apart from the petitioner, two other persons in the panel in serial No.12 and 13 were also found to be not eligible for promotion as Chief Engineer as they have also not having the requisite minimum period of one year of left over service before their retirement and they are only eligible for promotion to the post of Special Chief Engineer. According to the learned Additional Advocate General for the respondents, the panel drawn for promotion to the post of Chief Engineer for the year 2015-2016 has been exhausted, as there are no eligible person with one year of left over service before their retirement.

5. It is the further contention of the learned Additional Advocate General as per GO (Ms) No.440, Personnel and Administrative Reforms Department dated 26.10.1990, for promotion to the post of Head of Department, an officer should

have not less than one year minimum period of service before his or her retirement. Those who do not have such minimum period of left over service however fit for promotion as Head of Department will be compensated by appointing them as "Officer on Special Duty" with a specific assignment, but with the same scale of pay as that of the Head of Department. Subsequently, the Government issued GO (Ms) No.245, Public Works (A2) Department dated 08.08.2007 whereby amendments were carried out to Rule 5 of the Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Engineering Service Branch-1 (Public Works) ordering that for promotion to the post of Chief Engineer, one must have a minimum period of one year of left over service before retirement at the time of actual promotion. Thus, according to the learned Additional Advocate General, the crucial date of one year of left over service before retirement is at the time of actual promotion and not on the date of preparation of panel/approval. When the petitioner did not possess the requisite left over service period, he cannot be given promotion to the regular Chief Engineer post. In other words, at the time of retirement of Thiru. S. Sampath and Thiru. S. Ashokan, there was left over service of only 10 months for the petitioner to retire on 28.02.2017. Therefore, the submission of the petitioner that the panel has been prepared on 06.01.2016 and on that date he was eligible cannot be considered. The period of panel was over on 01.04.2016 and there was no post to accommodate the petitioner, while so, the relief sought for in this writ petition need not be granted.

6. As regards the claim of the petitioner that two posts of Chief Engineers are vacant as on 29.02.2016, one in Public Works Department (Chief Engineer, Plan Formulation) and another in Tamil Nadu Civil Supplies Corporation, a post held by the Chief Engineer of Public Works Department, one Thiru. S. Thinakaran was posted as Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, Plan Formulation, Chennai on the retirement of one Thiru. R. Selvam on 29.02.2016. Similarly, Thiru. M. Sampath Kumar, Chief Engineer, Public Works Department was deputed to the Tamil Nadu Civil Supplies Corporation, Chennai on foreign service and conditional basis. However, the said Thiru. M. Sampath Kumar retired on 30.11.2015 and after his retirement, there was no requisition made from the foreign employer/department. In the absence of such requisition from the foreign department or employer, the respondents cannot be faulted with.

7. The petitioner has filed a rejoinder to the counter filed on behalf of the respondents contending inter alia that in the promotional panel dated 06.01.2016, the petitioner was shown at serial No.11. The petitioner was identified as eligible for promotion to the post of Regular Chief Engineer by placing him in the 5th place out of the 7 estimated vacancies. Even though five vacancies were available at the relevant point of time, wantonly, the respondents have only filled up three vacancies and the fourth person in the panel namely Mr. Thinakaran was promoted on 30.04.2017. In between January and February, no posting order was issued to fill up the existing

vacancy. The petitioner ought to have been considered for promotion on 28.02.2016 before the lapse of one year minimum left over service. The term actual promotion referred to by the respondents would only mean the actual vacancy existing on a particular date.

8. The petitioner would further contend in the rejoinder that the post of Chief Engineer (General) is not a separate post and the person who holds the Engineer in Chief in Water Resources Organisation (WRO) or buildings will be in the same footing. As far as other departments are concerned, the post of Chief Engineer is filled up in Tamil Nadu Housing Board, Tamil Nadu Civil Supplies Corporation, Directorate of Technical Education and Corporation of Chennai. The above said four vacancies in the department have been created on the request made by foreign departments to depute Chief Engineer from the Public Works Department. Therefore, whenever there is vacancy arises in the above departments, the respondents used to fill up the post of Chief Engineer either by way of promotion or by transfer immediately on the date of incumbents retirement or vacancy arising on any other ground. Therefore, it cannot be said that there was no vacancy available to accommodate the petitioner while admitting that the petitioner was eligible for being promoted to the post of regular Chief Engineer. There are number of persons posted as Chief Engineer in other departments even though they were not having one year of left over service. In any event, the delay in issuing the promotional order to the petitioner is not a bar to appoint him in the existing vacancy without taking note of the one year period of left over service. According to the petitioner, because of the laches on the part of the respondents, his promotional prospects has been lost. The object behind imposing the condition that the promotee should have one year of left over service cannot be adopted as such or it was not the intention of the Government while issuing G.O. Ms. No.440, Personnel and Administrative Reforms Department dated 26.10.1990.

9. At the time of admission of this writ petition, this Court, by order dated 26.05.2016, granted an interim stay. The respondents, while filing counter in the above writ petition, have inter alia prayed for vacating the interim stay granted on 26.05.2016.

10. I heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents. In the combined panel drawn on 06.01.2016 for promotion to the post of Chief Engineer, the name of the petitioner was included in Serial No.11. The panel was drawn by taking into account the estimated vacancies as well. According to the petitioner, even at that time, there were 7 vacancies available but the respondents have filled up only three posts out of seven. The fourth post was filled up on 30.04.2016. The petitioner is the person to be promoted thereafter inasmuch as he was in serial No.5. As the petitioner was not considered for such promotion, he has come

up with this writ petition. According to the respondents, even though the petitioner has come within the zone of consideration and he was eligible to be promoted to the post of Chief Engineer, there was no vacancy available to accommodate him and the panel itself has lapsed on 31.03.2016. It is further claimed by the respondents that at the time of consideration of the claim of the petitioner for actual promotion, he was not having one year of left over service, as required. According to the respondents, as per the amendment brought in to Rule 5 of the Special Rules for the Tamil Nadu Engineering Service Branch - 1 (Public Works) prescribing the minimum left over service of one year before retirement for promotion and appointment of Chief Engineer by issuing GO Ms. No.245, Public Works Department dated 08.08.2007. As per the amendment, promotion to the post of Chief Engineer can be given to those eligible persons who have a minimum period of one year of left over service at the time of actual promotion.

11. In order to substantiate their claim that promotion to the post of Chief Engineer can be given to those eligible persons who have a minimum period of one year of left over service at the time of actual promotion, the respondents have produced a tabulated statement indicating the details of promotion conferred to the post of Chief Engineer in Public Works Department during 2015-2016 and it can usefully be extracted hereunder:-

S.No.	Name of CE/PWD Station	Date of Retirement	Date on which vacancy arose in PWD
	Name of Chief Engineer promoted on such retirement		
1.	D. John Britto D. Khaleel Ahmed (O & M)	CE, PWD 31.05.2015	01.06.2015
2.	M. Selvaraju Cauvery Tech.Cell	CE, PWD 31.05.2015	Downgraded as Executive Engineer Post once the individual vacated the post vide GO No.59 PW(C.Spl.2) Dept dated 28.02.2014
3.	P. Murugesan of Chennai	CE, Corporation 31.07.2015	No requisition received from foreign employer to depute a CE from PWD
4.	T.S. Rubyni	CE, PWD, DRCS 31.08.2015	01.09.2015 A. Venkatachalam
5.	A. Prithiviraj	CE, TNEB 31.10.2015	No requisition received from foreign employer

to depute a CE from PWD

6. M. Sampathkumar CE, TNCSC 30.11.2015 Norequisition
received from foreign
employer to depute a CE
from PWD
7. G. Anbalagan CE (Bldgs) PWD 30.11.2015 01.12.2015
V. Balasubramani
Madurai
8. M. Lalitha Rani CE, PWD, IWS 31.01.2016 01.02.2016
T. Kanithimathinathan
9. R. Selvam CE, PWD, PF 29.02.2016 01.03.2016
S. Thinakaran
10. S. Sampath EIC (Bldgs) PWD 30.04.2016 01.05.2016
11. S. Ashokan CE, PWD, WRD 30.04.2016 01.05.2016
Trichy Region
12. P.L. Valliappan CE, PWD, WRO 31.05.2016 01.06.2016
Madurai
13. E. Thamilarasan CE, PWD, WRO 31.05.2016 01.06.2016
Coimbatore
14. S. Thirumaran EIC, WRD & CE 30.06.2016 01.07.2016
General/PWD
15. P. Srinivasan CE, Technical 30.06.2016 01.07.2016
Education Dept
16. B. Rajeswari CE, PWD, WRO 31.07.2016 01.08.2016
SGSWRDG
17. V. Shanmugam CE, PWD, WRO 31.08.2016 01.09.2016
Chennai
18. K.V. Rajan Spl. Secretary to 30.09.2016 01.10.2016
Govt, PWD
Secretariat
19. D. Khaleel Ahmed CE, PWD, WRO 30.09.2016 01.10.2016
(O & M)
20. A. Murugesan CE (Bldgs), PWD 30.09.2016 01.10.2016
Trichy
21. K. Manuraj CE, PWD, IMTI 31.10.2016 01.11.2016

12. In the tabulation furnished on behalf of the respondents, the vacancies that arose during the year 2015 to 2016, upto October 2016 has been indicated. It is stated that all the promotions given or to be given pertains to the panel year 2015-2016. The two persons compared by the petitioner namely Thiru. Sampath and Thiru. Ashokan have retired from

their service on 30.04.2016 and by virtue of their retirement, two vacancies have arisen as on 01.05.2016 for promotion to the post of regular Chief Engineer. One another vacancy arose in which one Thiru. Thinakaran was promoted on 30.04.2016 as he was to retire on 30.04.2017. The said Thinakaran was senior to the petitioner and he was placed in serial No.7 of the panel drawn on 06.01.2016. As per the tabulation given above, there was no retirement in between 01.03.2016 to 30.04.2016. It is also evident that the vacancies that arose in the Public Works Department alone have been taken into consideration and there was no reference to the vacancies in other departments for deputation of the eligible person to hold the post of regular Chief Engineer.

13. In this background, now the question now arise for consideration in this writ petition is as to whether consideration for eligibility of a person to get promotion will arise on the date of preparation of the panel or on the date of actual promotion.

14. In normal parlance, there is no doubt that the answer to the question would be only from the date of actual promotion. But in the facts and circumstances of this particular case, whether such a criteria can be followed has to be considered. In this case, a panel was prepared on 06.01.2016 for the year 2015-2016. In the panel, the name of the petitioner was included and admittedly, even according to the respondents, he was eligible for being considered for promotion to the post of Regular Chief Engineer as on the date of preparation of such panel. At the time of preparation of the panel on 06.01.2016, the petitioner has got around 13 months of left over service inasmuch as he has to retire on 28.02.2017. If the vacancies that exist as on the date of preparation of panel on 06.01.2016 is taken into consideration and the posts were filled up or atleast the posts which were available as on 28.02.2016 is taken into account, by which time the petitioner had one year of left over service, the petitioner would have been promoted to the post of regular Chief Engineer. By reason of non-consideration of the petitioner for promotion, he has lost his right to get promoted to the post of regular Chief Engineer subsequently by reason of efflux of time.

15. It is no doubt true that the petitioner was promoted to the post of Special Chief Engineer, which according to the respondents carries equal scale of pay and almost similar assignments. According to the petitioner, there are vacancies available to the post of Chief Engineer in other departments or foreign departments in which he could have been considered for promotion to the post of regular Chief Engineer on deputation. Repudiating such submission, the respondents would contend that unless they receive requisition from other department for deputation, they cannot automatically depute an eligible person to hold the post of regular Chief Engineer in such foreign service.

16. Having regard to the above submissions, this Court could only observe that there are precedents to show that deputation was conferred to eligible persons to hold the post of regular Chief Engineer in other departments. In this case, admittedly, the petitioner was eligible to be promoted to the post of regular Chief Engineer at the relevant point of time. Therefore, the respondents could have explored the possibility of accommodating the petitioner atleast in foreign service by deputation. The respondents could have interacted with other departments to accommodate the eligible persons like the petitioner to hold the post of regular Chief Engineer on foreign service. Merely because the requisitioning authority did not seek for deputation, the respondents could not deny the service right to the petitioner. The petitioner, after rendering long number of years of service, could naturally prefer to hold the post of regular Chief Engineer, which promotion cannot be denied by the respondents. However, in this regard, this Court cannot give a positive direction to the respondents to do so but this Court only observe that the respondents could have explored such a possibility to depute eligible persons like the petitioner to hold the post of regular Chief Engineer on deputation in foreign service in other departments.

17. At this juncture, the learned counsel for the petitioner would vehemently contend that on the date of preparation of panel on 06.01.2016, the petitioner was eligible for promotion to the post of regular Chief Engineer. At the time, there were also vacancy to accommodate him either in the Public Works Department or any other department on deputation. By reason of the inaction on the part of the respondents in exploring such possibility, the petitioner's service right to get promoted to the regular post of Chief Engineer has been denied. It is further stated that it is not necessary for the requisitioning authority to seek for deputation and it is well open to the respondents to identify the vacancies and to accommodate the eligible persons on deputation so that atleast they can have the satisfaction of having retired from service upon holding the highest post in their career. In this regard, the learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the decision of the Honourable Supreme Court in the case of (Major General H.M. Singh, VSM vs. Union of India and another) (Civil Appeal No. 192 of 2014 (arising out of SLP (C) No. 2008 of 2010) dated 09th January 2014 wherein the Honourable Supreme Court observed that the appellant therein possess the merit and ability for promotion to the post of rank of Lieutenant General, but he was promoted only to the rank of substantive Major General from 07.01.2004. The Supreme Court also observed that for the vacancy which had arisen on 01.01.2007, the selection Board came to be constituted only on 27.02.2008 and such delay had defeated the service right of the appellant therein to get promoted to the post of Lieutenant General. At the time when the vacancy arose for consideration on 01.01.2007, the appellant had 14 months of service but two days prior to his retirement, the selection Board has been constituted. In such circumstances, the Honourable Supreme Court went to the extent

of holding that the appellant shall be deemed to have been in service against the rank of Lieutenant General till 28.02.2009 and he would be entitled to all monetary benefits which would have been due to him on account of his promotion to the rank of Lieutenant General till his retirement on superannuation, as also, to revised retiral benefits which would have accrued to him on account of such promotion.

18. In the present case also, the petitioner was eligible for consideration for promotion to the post of regular Chief Engineer when the panel was drawn on 06.01.2016. The respondents never explored the possibility of accommodating the petitioner in other departments on deputation. In fact, on 04.05.2016, the petitioner has submitted a representation seeking to consider his claim for holding the post of regular Chief Engineer, but it was not considered and orders passed thereon. Therefore, this Court only feels that though there were vacancies in the Public Works Department in which the petitioner could not be accommodated, he could have at least been considered for being accommodated in similar vacancies that arose in other departments. It is also not out of place to mention that the practice of sending eligible employees on deputation to hold the post of regular Chief Engineer was very much prevalent in the Public Works Department and therefore whenever there was a need, the respondents also ought to have resorted to confer promotion by transfer or deputation as the case may be. At the same time it is also to be mentioned that until March 2016, the claim of the petitioner could not be considered inasmuch as there were seniors in the panel who have to be considered by the respondents and such a course of action adopted by the respondents cannot be faulted with. Therefore, suffice to state that the first respondent shall consider accommodating the petitioner on deputation in other departments where there are vacancies exist on the basis of the representation submitted by the petitioner.

19. Before concluding, it is necessary to clarify that this Court has not concluded that the claim of the petitioner for promotion has to be considered from the date of preparation of panel. As mentioned above, it is clarified and reiterated that the eligibility for claiming promotion will arise only if the eligible person has got service of not less than one year on the date of his or her actual promotion and not from the date of preparation of panel. But only in so far as the petitioner is concerned, since he ought to have been considered by the respondents for promotion as regular Chief Engineer at least on deputation in other departments at the relevant date, for which vacancies were available, this Court is of the view that he could have been considered for promotion on deputation in other departments.

20. In the result, the writ petition is disposed of by directing the first respondent to consider the representation dated 04.05.2016 of the petitioner in the light of the above observations made by this Court and orders shall be passed within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy

of this order inasmuch as the petitioner has got few months of left over service. No costs. Consequently, WMP No. 15824 of 2016 is closed.

rsh

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

To

1. The Principal Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009
2. The Chief Engineer (General)
Public Works Department, Kamarajar Salai
Chennai.
3. The Principal Secretary to Government
Personnel & Administrative Reforms Department
Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009.

+ 1 cc to Mr.R.Syed Mustafa, Advocate Sr 44468

+ 1 cc to The Govt. Pleader, Sr 44569

KR/10/8/16

WP No.18032 of 2016

सत्यमेव जयते

WEB COPY