

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED :24.11.2017
CORAM
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
W.P.No.11741 of 2010
and
M.P.No.1 of 2010

R.Moorthi

..Petitioner

vs

1.District Collector,
Tiruvanamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.

2.District Employment Officer,
Tiruvannamalai.

3.Chief Educational Officer,
Tiruvannamalai.

4.District Educational Officer,
Tiruvannamalai.

.. Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 2nd respondent to sponsor the name of the petitioner for the post of Last Grade Service, according to Employment Exchange Seniority, treating all the priority categories as Common, and without any discrimination and thus render justice.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Ganesan
for M/s.C.S.Associates

For Respondents : Mr.A.Rajaperumal
Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

The relief sought for in this writ petition is for a direction to the 2nd respondent to sponsor the name of the petitioner for the post of Last Grade Service, according to Employment Exchange Seniority, treating all the Priority Categories as Common, and without discrimination.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner made a submission that the respondents in proceedings dated 05.10.2009, provided an assurance that the name of the petitioner will be sponsored in accordance with the seniority based on his age and communal rotation. However, no such

consideration has been extended to the writ petitioner so far and the writ petitioner is awaiting for the call letter.

3.Mere Registration of the name in the Employment Exchange will not confer any right. No doubt, the writ petitioner may be under the category of land-losers and however, the same is also to be considered in accordance with the seniority. This being the fact, the appointment can never be claimed as a matter of right and the appointment is to be considered in accordance with the rules in force and based on the seniority. This apart, the writ petitioner, at the time of filing of the writ petition, was aged about 46 years and now, he would be about 53 years of age. Thus, the question of considering the relief as such sought for does not arise at all.

4.Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS IV)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kak

To

1.The District Collector,
Tiruvanamalai District,
Tiruvannamalai.

2.The District Employment Officer,
Tiruvannamalai.

3.The Chief Educational Officer,
Tiruvannamalai.

4.The District Educational Officer,
Tiruvannamalai.

+1 cc to M/s.C.S.Associates sr 84044

+2 ccs to the Govt pleader sr 84371,84379

W.P.No.11741 of 2010

aa16/12/2017