

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.09.2017

CORAM

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

W.P.No.8956 of 2016

P.Rajendran

..Petitioner

Vs

1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by Secretary,
Home Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai.

2.The Director General of Police,
Madras -04.

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of mandamus, to direct the 1st respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner made on 30.7.2015 seeking for the promotion for the post of Superintendent of Police on and from 09.10.2007 the date on which his juniors were promoted as Superintendent of Police and accord all consequential benefits to the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Ms.R.Sripriya
for M/s.V.Raghavachari

For Respondents : Mr.S.Gunasekaran
Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

The relief sought for in this writ petition is for a direction to the first respondent to consider the representation submitted by the writ petitioner petitioner dated 30.7.2015, in respect of the promotion to the post of Superintendent of Police with retrospective effect.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner made a submission that the writ petitioner was holding the post of Additional Superintendent of Police and retired from service on attaining the age of superannuation. However, the right of promotion to the post of Superintendent of Police, is denied and

in this regard, the writ petitioner had submitted a representation to the first respondent on 30.7.2015.

3. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents at the out set opposed the contentions raised on behalf of the writ petitioner by stating that the writ petitioner is not at all qualified to the post of Superintendent of Police and in this regard a counter is also filed in this writ petition.

4. However, the prayer sought for in the writ petition is only for a direction to consider the representation and further this Court is of the view that the writ petitioner is entitled to get the reply from the competent authority in respect of the representation submitted on 30.7.2015. In other words, the representation submitted by the writ petitioner ought to have been considered and at least a reply should have been communicated to the writ petitioner. However, no such reply has been communicated to the writ petition so far.

5. Thus, without going in to the merits of the case, the first respondent is directed to consider the representation submitted by the writ petitioner on 30.7.2015 and pass orders on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of. However, no order as to costs.

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar (CS VIII)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

ms
To

1.The Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Home Department,
Fort St.George, Chennai.

2.The Director General of Police,
Madras -04.

+1cc to Government Pleader in sr.no.70097

W.P.No.8956 of 2016

KK(CO)
NR 26/10/2017