

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :12.07.2017

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P. No.17662 of 2017

G.Jaiganesh

... Petitioner

.Vs.

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Principal Secretary
to Government, Rural Development &
Panchayat Raj Department,
Fort. St. George, Chennai-600 009.
 2. The Commissioner of Rural Development
& Panchayat Raj, Panagal Building
Saidapet, Chennai 600 015.
 3. The District Collector (PD Section)
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.
- ...Respondents

Prayer : Petition filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to consider the case of the Petitioner for appointment to the post of Typist pursuant to the letter written by the third respondent to the second respondent in Na/Ka/No.K2/3741 dated 21.03.2016 and appoint the petitioner in the cadre of typist including his name in the panel of typist for the year 2014 in the appropriate place with all the benefits like arrears of scale of pay etc.,

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Suthakar

For Respondents : Mr.J.H.Iniyan
Government Advocate

O R D E R

The learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner contended that the petitioner was initially appointed as Fitter Assistant (Nominal Muster Roll) on 10.01.1997 and at present he is holding the post of Office Assistant.

2. The writ petitioner is qualified for promotion to the post of typist and he possessed the required qualification in accordance with rules. 10% quota is fixed under the rules to consider the promotion more specifically from time to time amongst the employees working in Group-IV. Though such quota is provided under the Government Orders the respondents are not effecting the same periodically in accordance with the proportion and vacancies arising in the cadre of typist. In this regard, the representation submitted by the writ petitioners was already considered and the proposal was sent by the District Collector, Krishnagiri to the Director and Commissioner of Rural Development and Panchayat Raj in proceedings dated 21.03.2016.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner contended that it would be suffice if a direction is issued to the authorities to take a decision based on the proposals sent by the District Collector, Krishnagiri.

4. In this view of the matter, this Court is inclined to direct the second respondent to consider the proposals submitted by the District Collector, Krishnagiri in proceedings Na.Ka.No.K2/3741/2016 dated 21.03.2016 and pass orders on merits and in accordance with law within a period of 8 weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

5. With the above direction, the writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS V)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

smn/kas

To.

1. The Principal Secretary
to Government, Rural Development &
Panchayat Raj Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort. St. George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Rural Development
& Panchayat Raj, Panagal Building
Saidapet, Chennai 600 015.

3. The District Collector (PD Section)
Krishnagiri District,
Krishnagiri.

+1cc to Mr.V.Suthakar, Advocate, S.R.No.48476
+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.49092

W.P. No. 17662 of 2017

MG (CO)
CS (08/08/17)



WEB COPY