



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 21.06.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.(MD)No.3564 of 2015

Sakthimanohar

... Petitioner

-Vs-

The Secretary,
Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission,
Chennai.

...Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the respondent in Memorandum No.5927/PSD-E1/2014 dated 10.02.2015 and quash the same as illegal and arbitrary and in consequence thereby declare the petitioner as eligible candidate for recruitment of Village Administrative Officer for 2013-2014.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Ganapathi Subramanian
For Respondent : Mr.K.K.Senthil

ORDER

The order of rejection, rejecting the application of the writ petitioner for selection to the post of Village Administrative Officer in proceeding dated 10.02.2015 is under challenge in the present Writ Petition.

2.Admittedly, the writ petitioner had not paid required examination fees as per the instructions provided along with application. On account of non-payment of the examination fees, the application of the writ petitioner was rejected.

3.The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent states that scrutinising of applications are done through the computers and rejection was done as per the procedures and in accordance with the instructions and brochures issued to the writ petitioner. A candidate, who has not paid examination fees, is not entitled to participate in the process of selection.

4.Even in case, where such mistakes are occurred, this Court is of the considered opinion that the same must have been rectified, within a permissible time limit and it cannot be done beyond the time limit stipulated, if any in the brochure. Admittedly, the writ



petitioner had not paid examination fees nor corrected the mistakes by paying examination fees, within a time limit granted. Therefore, the writ petitioner has not availed time limit granted for corrections of mistakes also.

5. This being the factum, this Court is not inclined to consider the relief as such sought for in the present Writ Petition. This apart, the selection is of the year 2013-2014 and now, 5 years lapsed. The writ petitioner can participate in the forthcoming process of selection, if any notified by the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission.

6. With these observations, this Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AD-I)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

+1 CC to Mr.K.K.SENTHIL, Advocate SR-70791.

W.P (MD) No. 3564 of 2015
21.06.2019

CS: (03/07/2019) 2P 2C