

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

[Reserved on : 05.09.2019]

[Pronounced on : 12.09.2019]

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE M.M.SUNDRESH
and
THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE RMT.TEEKAA RAMAN

Review Application Nos.59 to 77, 96 & 97/2017
in

W.P.Nos.8531, 8562, 8563, 8564, 8565, 8571,
8572, 8594, 8595, 8596, 8598, 8599, 8600, 8678,
8681, 8682, 8746, 8865, 9363, 8391 & 12480/2016

1	RAYAPPAN	...Review.Appln.No.59/2017
	S/O.ANTHONYSWAMY GRADE II POLICE CONSTABLE	
	28016 V5. THIRUMANGALAM PS. CHENNAI CITY	
	CHENNAI-40	
1	K.DEVI	...Rev.Appln in 60 of 2017
1	A.ANTONY PITCHAI	...Rev.Appln in 61 of 2017
1	V.ARTHEESWARI	...Rev.Appln in 62 of 2017
1	P.POORNIMA	...Rev.Appln in 63 of 2017
1	V.ASOKAN	...Rev.Appln in 64 of 2017
1	R.SENTHIL KUAMR	...Rev.Appln in 65 of 2017
1	K.MADASAMY	...Rev.Appln in 66 of 2017
1	MANIKANDAN	...Rev.Appln in 67 of 2017
1	DEEPAK	...Rev.Appln in 68 of 2017
1	VELAN	...Rev.Appln in 69 of 2017

1	K.SRINIVASAN	...Rev.Appln in 70 of 2017
1	A.ASHOK PRABHAKARAN	...Rev.Appln in 71 of 2017
1	S.BABU	...Rev.Appln in 72 of 2017
1	S.JAYABABU	...Rev.Appln in 73 of 2017
1	L.SAKTHIRAJ	...Rev.Appln in 74 of 2017
1	K.SRITHARAKRISHNAN	...Rev.Appln in 75 of 2017
1	K.PRABHU SIVASANKAR	...Rev.Appln in 76 of 2017
1	M.GURUPRASAD	...Rev.Appln in 77 of 2017
1	P.DIWAKAR	...Rev.Appln in 96 of 2017
1	M.TAMILSAIVANAN	...Rev.Appln in 97 of 2017

Vs

1.The Secretary to Government
Home (Police II) Department
Fort St.George, Chennai-9

...R1 in all Rev.application

2. The Principal Secretary
P & A Reforms Department
Fort St.George Chennai-9

...R2 in Rev.Aplc 59/17,
63/17, 64/17, 65/17, 66/17, 67/17
68/17, 70/17, 71/17, 72/17
73/17, 77/17

3.The Director General of Police
Dr.Radhakrishnan Salai
Mylapore Chennai-4

...R2 in Rev.A.60/17, 61/17
62/17, 69/17, 74/17, 75/17
76/17, 96/17

..R3 in Rev.A.59/17, 63/17
64/17, 65/17, 66/17, 67/17
68/17, 70/17, 71/17, 72/17,
73/17, 77/17

4. The Member Secretary

Tamil Nadu Uniformed Services

Recruitment Board Egmore Chennai-8

..R3 in Rev.A.60/17,
61/17,62/17,65/17,69/17
74/17,75/17,76/17,96/17

..R4 in Rev.A.59/17,63/17
64/17,65/17,66/17,67/17
68/17,70/17,71/17,72/17
73/17, 77/17

Prayer in Review Application No.59 of 2017 to 77, & 96 & 97 of 2017:

These Review Applications preferred under Order 47 Rule 1 of C.P.C. R/W Section 114 of C.P.C. against the order of this Court dated 14.03.2016 made in W.P. No.8531 of 2016, 8562,8563,8564,8565,8571,8572,8594,8595,8596,8598,8599,8600,8678 ,8681,8682,8746,8865,9363,8391 & 12480/2016.

WP No.8531 of 2016

calling for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.2015 (Enrolment No.5400232) and quash the same in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub Inspector (under 20% departmental quota) and direct the respondents to award 2 marks to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of D Series Question Nos.57, 59, 137 and 153 and consequently select and appoint him as Sub Inspector of Police and grant him all consequential service benefits

WP No.8562 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in connection with the impugned order dt.15.11.15 (Enrolment NO.5400395) and quash the same in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub-Inspector (under 20% departmental quota) and direct the Respondents to award 1 mark to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of A Series Question NOs. 1 and 82 and consequently select and appoint her as Sub-Inspector of Police and grant her all consequential service benefits

WP No.8563 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No. 8000597) and quash the same in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub-Inspector (under 20 % departmental quota) and direct the Respondents to award 2 marks to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of A Series Question

Nos.1, 36, 82, 128 and consequently select and appoint him as Sub-Inspector of Police and grant him all consequential service benefits

WP No.8564 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in connection with the impugned Result dated 15.11.2015 through Website (Enrolment No.5102063) and quash the same, in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub-Inspector (Under 20% Departmental Quota) and direct the respondents to award one (1) mark to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of C Series Question Nos.64 & 83 and consequently select and appoint him as Sub Inspector of Police and grant her all consequential service benefits

WP No.8565 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No.5500040) and quash the same and direct the respondents to earmark separate mark under priority quota as per clause 6 (e) of the prospectus earmarked for 20% of the persons studied in Tamil Medium for selection to the post of Sub-Inspector (Women) for the year 2015 for the 20% departmental candidates forthwith for 20% Departmental Quota candidates and consider the claim of the petitioner for appointment under PSTM quota or alternatively award 2 1/2 mark to the petitioner for the correct answers given by her for D Series Question NOs. 57, 101, 137, 149 and 153 and select...

WP No.8571 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in connection with the impugned order dt 15.11.2015 (Enrolment No.5200104) and quash the same and direct the respondents to earmark separate mark under the priority quota as per Clause 6(e) of prospectus therein 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 or alternatively further direct the respondents to award three (3) marks to the petitioner for the correct answers given by him for having given correct answers in respect of D Series Question Nos.11, 57, 59, 78, 101 and 153 and consequently.....

WP No.8572 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.2015 (Enrolment No.5600115) and quash the same, in so far as not selecting the petitioner for appointment to the Post of Sub Inspector of Police under 20% Departmental Quota and seeking direction, directing to the respondents to earmark separate mark under the priority quota as

per Clause 6(e) of Prospectus therein earmarking 20% for persons studied in Tamil Medium for selection to the Post of Sub Inspector of Police (M) for the year 2015 for the 20% Departmental candidates forthwith, and consider the claim of the petitioner for appointment under PSTM Quota or alternatively award two marks to the petitioner for...

WP No.8594 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No. 5102280) and quash the same, in so far as denying him to participate in the next state of selection and seeking direction, directing to the respondents to earmark separate mark under the priority quota as per Clause 6(e) of prospectus therein earmarking 20% for persons studied in Tamil Medium for selection to the post of Sub-Inspector of Police (M) for the year 2015 for the 20% departmental candidates forthwith, and consider the claim of the petitioner for appointment under PSTM quota or alternatively award one (1) mark to the petitioner for the correct answers given by him for in D Serious...

WP No.8595 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No. 5100653) and quash the same, in so far as denying him to participate in the next state of selection and seeking direction, directing to the respondents to earmark separate mark under the priority quota as per Clause 6(e) of prospectus therein 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 or alternatively award 2 1/2 marks to the petitioner for the correct answers given by him for in C Series Question Nos.6, 37, 62, 131 and 142 select...

WP No.8596 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No. 5100752) and quash the same, in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub-Inspector (under 20% departmental quota) and direct the respondents to award 3.5 marks to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of D Series Question Nos. 11, 37, 57, 59, 101, 137 and 153 and consequently select and appoint him as Sub-Inspector of Police and grant him all consequential service benefits

WP No.8598 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No. 5100812) and quash the same, in so far as denying appointment to the

petitioner as Sub Inspector (under 20% departmental quota) and direct the respondents to award 2 marks to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of A Series Question Nos.1, 63, 82 and 102 and consequently select and appoint him as Sub-Inspector of Police and grant him all consequential service benefits

WP No.8599 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No. 5100884) and quash the same, in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub Inspector (under 20% departmental quota) and direct the respondents to award 1/2 mark to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of D Series Question Nos.11 and consequently select and appoint him as Sub-Inspector of Police and grant him all consequential service benefits

WP No.8600 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No. 5300221) and quash the same, in so far as denying him to participate in the next state of selection and seeking direction, directing to the respondents to earmark separate mark under the priority quota as per Clause 6(e) of prospectus therein 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 or alternatively award 1 1/2 marks to the petitioner for the correct answers given by him for in A Series Question Nos.1, 82 and 128 select...

WP No.8678 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No. 5600183) and quash the same, in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub Inspector (under 20% departmental quota) and direct the respondents to award 3 marks to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of C Series Question Nos.42, 62, 73, 106, 142 and 158 and consequently select and appoint him as Sub-Inspector of Police and grant him all consequential service benefits

WP No.8681 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No. 5400230) and quash the same, in so far as denying him to participate in the next state of selection and seeking direction, directing the respondents to earmark separate mark under the priority quota as per Clause 6(e) of prospectus therein earmarked for 20% of the persons studied in Tamil Medium for selection to the post of

Sub-Inspector (Men) for the year 2015 for the 20% departmental candidates forthwith and consider the claim of the petitioner for appointment under PSTM quota and consider the claim of the petitioner for appointment under PSTM quota or alternatively award Two (2) marks to..

WP No.8682 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No. 5900032) and quash the same, in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub Inspector (under 20% departmental quota) and direct the respondents to award 1 1/2 marks to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of D Series Question Nos.11,59 and 78 and consequently select and appoint him as Sub-Inspector of Police and grant him all consequential service benefits

WP No.8746 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in connection with the impugned result through website dt 15.11.2015 (Enrolment No.6400150) and quash the same in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub-Inspector (under 20% departmental quota) and direct the Respondents to award 1/2 marks to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of B Series Question Nos. 21 and consequently select and appoint the petitioner as Sub-Inspector of Police and grant him all consequential service benefits

WP No.8865 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No. 6400110) and quash the same, in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub Inspector (under 20% departmental quota) and direct the respondents to award 1/2 marks to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of B Series Question Nos.21 and consequently select and appoint him as Sub-Inspector of Police and grant him all consequential service benefits

WP No.9363 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 4th respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No.5300286) and quash the same, in so far as not selecting the petitioner for appointment to the post of Sub Inspector of Police under 20% departmental quota and seeking direction, directing to the respondents to earmark separate mark under the priority quota as per clause 6(e) of prospectus therein 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 or alternatively award two (2) marks to the petitioner for

the correct answers given by.....

WP No.8391 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in connectin with the impugned order dt. 15.11.15 (Enrolment No.5102048) and quash the same in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub-Inspector (under 20% departmental quota) and direct the Respondents to award 3 marks to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of D Series Question Nos. 11, 37, 57 and 101 and consequently select and appoint him as Sub-Inspector of Police and grant him all consequential service

WP No.12480 of 2016

Calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in connection with the impugned order dated 15.11.15 (Enrolment No.5102037) and quash the same in so far as denying appointment to the petitioner as Sub-Inspector (Under 20% departmental quota) and direct the Respondents to award one mark to the petitioner for having given correct answers in respect of A Series Question Nos.1 and 84 and consequently select and appoint him as Sub-Inspector of Police and grant him all consequential service benefits.

In All Rev. Applications:

For Petitioners: Mr. ARL. Sundaresan, Senior Counsel
& Mr.R.Venkatramani, Senior Counsel
for Mr. M. Muthappan(in all Cases)

For Respondents: Tmt. Narmadha Sampath,
Additional Advocate General
Assist by Mr. V.Kadhirvelu,
Special Government Pleader(in all cases)

- - - - -

COMMON ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by M.M.SUNDRESH, J.)

All these Review Applications have been filed seeking to Review the common order passed in the batch of the Writ Petitions in W.P.Nos.8531 of 2016 and etc., dated 14.03.2016.

2. The Petitioners are the Police Constables working in the State of Tamil Nadu. They also participated in the recruitment to the post of Sub-Inspector of Police in the year 2015 under the Department quota. After the written examination, the Petitioners participated in the viva-voce. Thereafter, results were published. The entire process along with the time limit has been recorded by this Court in the common order dated 14.03.2016 passed in W.P.Nos.8531 of 2016 etc., batch of cases respectively, which is reproduced hereunder:-

"The matters are fully covered by our order dated 07.03.2016 in W.P.No.8391 of 2016 (P.Diwakar V. The Secretary to Government, Home (Police II) Department, Fort St. George, Chennai - 9 and others) and thus, necessarily the same order must follow in these petitions. In the said order, it was observed as under:-

2. The Petitioner went through the physical endurance test conducted from 03.08.2015 to 05.08.2015 and consequently results were published on 21.08.2015. We may note that for recruitment of 1078 candidates, more than 1.85 lakhs candidates participated, and the results were declared on the basis of ratio of 1:5 for each category. Post PET results, the next stage of viva-voce was in the ratio of 1:2. The petitioner went through the viva-voce, which was conducted from 03.09.2015 to 15.10.2015 and the final provisional select list was published on 15.11.2015. The petitioner went through the complete process of examination at every stage having no grievance, but unfortunately at the final stage, he did not make it. This is, naturally the consequence as for each of the categories, double the number of candidates were called for the interview as against the required posts. We emphasise this because in the process of selection with large number of candidates, there will be many who will fall by the side. The present writ petition has been now preferred stating that the petitioner had some doubts on the key answers to certain questions for which one week's time had been granted to file objections on 01.03.2016 based on a representation dated 23.12.2015 requiring the coding sheet to be supplied, which was supplied on 28.05.2015.

3. We are setting aside the aforesaid dates, saying much after the period was over, the petitioner woke up and seeks to somehow get into the provisional select list.

4. We were faced with hundreds of cases during the selection process having dealt with each stage at the relevant time, so as to get the final stage and the result declaration. The candidates qualifying only at the particular stage would go to the next stage and that is the reason we monitored the process. The grievance/ cause of auction would arise at that stage in such examinations and we cannot expect the candidate to sleep over his/her rights and they must act promptly. In fact, we have rejected a large number of cases where petitioners had an afterthought based upon the subsequent stage performance to question the previous stage only to get in as a candidate qualified at the subsequent stage. Such a request cannot be permitted once the examination process is over, when the cause of action for the petitioner expired on one week expiring from 28.05.2015."

2. The writ petitions are dismissed. We were inclined to impose costs of Rs.2,500/- (Rupees Two Thousand Five Hundred) in each of the petitions to be deposited by the respective petitioners with the Mediation and Conciliation Centre, Madras High Court Campus. However, the learned Additional Advocate General informs us that imposition of costs would be placed in the service register of the individual writ petitioners. So, we desist from imposing costs. Consequently, all connected miscellaneous petitions are closed."

The aforesaid common order was passed placing reliance upon the earlier order dated 07.03.2016 passed in W.P.No.8391 of 2016.

3. Aggrieved over the aforesaid orders, the petitioners filed a Special Leave Petition in SLP No.277/17 etc batch, which were disposed of by the order of the Apex Court dated 30.01.2017. The order passed by the Apex Court reads as follows:-

"Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that there are some factual errors in the impugned

judgment passed by the High Court. He would like to file review petitions in the High Court.

The special leave petitions are dismissed with the liberty granted to the petitioners to file review petitions. In case the review petitions are filed within four weeks, the High Court shall not dismiss the review petitions on the ground of limitation".

4. Thus, seeking to review the common order passed by this Court rejecting the writ petitions on the ground of delay, laches and accusations, these review applications have been filed.

5. Mr.ARL.Sundaresan, learned Senior Counsel and Mr.R.Venkataramani, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Petitioners would submit that there is no delay actually that has occasioned. The copies of the coding sheets were supplied subsequently. The modified list was published in pursuant to the orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.27016 of 2015, dated 03.11.2015. Therefore, there is no delay that has occasioned. On merit, the petitioners have demonstrated that some of the key answers, which are disputed, are not correct. Thus, the orders passed would require to be reviewed particularly, in the light of the materials supplied.

6. Mrs.Narmadha Sampath, learned Additional Advocate General assisted by Mr.V.Kadhirvelu, learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the State has submitted that there is no factual error in the orders passed. The petitioners are fence-sitters and they have not filed any objections as provided under para 3 of the Notification. 273 representations were received till the last date - 05.06.2015 for 60 questions for open examination and for 91 questions for Departmental examination.

7. Accordingly, expert key answers were hosted in the website on 18.07.2015. Based upon the Expert Opinion, the answers were modified for seven questions in open examinations and 7 questions in Departmental Examination. The Petitioners did not give any written representations as mandated in para 3 of the Notification r/w instruction No.13 of the Hall Ticket. No such ground has been raised in the affidavit filed in support of the applications. Law is quite settled on the issue of revaluation. Therefore, the Review Applications will have to be dismissed.

8. In W.P.No.27016 of 2015, dated 03.11.2015, the Division Bench of this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

"4. On the remaining aspects the matter was examined on 13.10.2015 when we passed the following order:-

"We have heard the learned counsel for the parties on the limited issue of Question Nos.64 and 83. In respect of Question No.64, there is no dispute that the correct form is Form No.91, as opined in Writ Petition Nos.23511 to 23515 of 2015 by order dated 16.09.2015. The plea of the Petitioner, however, is that there could be a possibility of confusion in the mind of the petitioner, despite being an in-service candidate, arising from the Police Standing Order, prescribing it as Form No.88.

2. In respect of Question No.83, what was asked for is the time allowed for an appeal against acquittal. Learned Additional Advocate General has drawn our attention to Section 378 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, where sub-section 5 prescribes for sixty days' period for grant of special leave to appeal in cases, other than those with the complainant being a public servant, where the period prescribed is six months. Instantly, the question does not state as to whether it is a case of special leave appeal, whether the acquittal is arising in a complaint from a public servant or any other case, only mentioning of period in months, though the period for appeal in case of acquittal of any other person is specified as sixty days. Learned counsel for the petitioner, on the other hand, has drawn our attention to the same police Standing Order to state that at [page 638 (Page 82 of the typed-set filed by the petitioner) in Clause (4) (a), the time allowed for filling an appeal is specified as three months by referring to G.O.Ms.No.630, Home, dated 10.03.1955."

5. We have permitted the petitioner to go through the viva- voce in terms of our order dated 15.10.2015 and the viva-voce has now been completed.

6. In view of the reasons recorded on 13.10.2015, and the possibility of confusion as set out therein on account of the ambiguity in the questions framed, we are of the view that the petitioner is entitled to the half mark and would thus qualify for the next stage of viva-voce, which the petitioner has gone through."

9. The submission of the learned Senior Counsels appearing for the petitioners that there is no delay in fact cannot be countenanced. The Division Bench of this Court has clearly stated that the applicants have slept over the matter. Though it is contended that some of the applicants have made representations, no such plea has been taken in the affidavits filed in support of the writ petitions. Even in the counter affidavit filed before us, the same has been disputed. Para 20 of the counter affidavit reads as follows:-

"20. It is further submitted that as per the note appended to Para 3 of the Notification, the candidates were asked to make representation to the Board regarding dispute over questions and answers along with material proof within 7 days from the date of publication of preliminary answer key and the relevant portion is produced hereunder:-

"After completion of Written Examination, the answer key will be published on www.tnusrbexams.net candidates may make representation to the Board (in writing) raising a dispute over questions and/or answers along with the material proof within 7 days from the date of publication of answer key".

10. When these compliance have not been made, the applicants are not entitled to seek any remedy before this Court. It is settled law that a candidate is not entitled for revaluation as a matter of right sans the existence of the Rule. The applicants have approached the Court after undergoing the entire process of selection. It cannot be stated that the cause of action would arise only after furnishing of the copies of the coding sheet. The said contention, if accepted, would be contrary to para 4 of the Notification referred to above. Same is also the contention based on the judgment of the Division Bench referred supra to justify the delay.

11. The applicants actually seek a re-adjudication by asking this Court to go into the issue qua the correctness of the key answers. This cannot be termed as a factual error as

submitted before the Honourable Apex Court. The order dated 30.01.2017 of the Apex Court also indicates that submissions have been made to the effect that there were some factual errors in the order sought to be reviewed. A review can never be the one akin to rehearing.

12. For yet another reason, we are inclined to hold the review applications as not maintainable. What was challenged in the Writ Petitions is the final result published dated 15.11.2015. All the applicants have filed the Writ Petitions few months thereafter. The Notification prescribes the number of posts filled up. These posts were actually filled up with the other candidates, who underwent the process of selection. They are also not before us. Thus, looking from any perspective, we do not find any ground which is made out to allow these applications. We are also of the view that there is no factual error which could be pointed out by the petitioners in the common order sought to be reviewed. We may also note that already a process of verifying the disputed questions was undertaken by the Experts before finalizing the key answers on 18.07.2015.

13. Accordingly, all these Review Applications stand dismissed. No costs.

-s/d-
Assistant Registrar(CSIII)

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

jrl/ebsi

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Home (Police II) Department,
Fort St George, Chennai-9.
2. The Principal Secretary,
Personnel & Administrative
Reforms Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 9.
3. The Director General of Police,
Dr. Radhakrishnan Salai,
Mylapore, Chennai - 4.

4. The Member Secretary,
Tamil Nadu Uniformed Services
Recruitment Board,
Egmore,
Chennai - 600 008.

+21 cc to Mr.M.Muthappan Advocate sr78355

Common Order made in

Review Application Nos.59 to 77, 96 & 97/2017
in

W.P.Nos.8531, 8562, 8563, 8564,
8565, 8571, 8572, 8594, 8595,
8596, 8598, 8599, 8600, 8678,
8681, 8682, 8746, 8865,
9363, 8391 & 12480/2016

ad(co)
aa15/10/2019