



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 21.08.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P[MD]No.7131 of 2015

S.Radhakrishnan

: Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.Director General of Police (L&O),
Dr.Radhakrishnan Salai,
Mylapore, Chennai - 600 004.

3.Director General of Police / Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Uniformed Services,
Recruitment Board,
Anna Salai, Chennai - 600 002.

4.Public Information Officer /
Superintendent of Police,
Tamil Nadu Uniformed Services,
Recruitment Board,
Chennai - 600 002.

: Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the proceedings of the third respondent dated 28.08.2014 made in C.No.R2/01947/2014 and quash the same and direct the respondents to revise and refix the petitioner's seniority after awarding one mark to the right answer marked by him in the written test and change his category from Sub Inspector of Police (TSP) to Sub Inspector of Police (Armed Reserve).

For Petitioner : Mr.S.M.Mohan Gandhi

For Respondents : Mr.K.Mu.Muthu

Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

The relief sought for in this Writ Petition is for a direction directing the respondents to revise and re-fix the petitioners' seniority after awarding respective marks to the right answers marked by him in the written test and change his category from Sub Inspector of Police (TSP) to Sub-Inspector of Police (Armed Reserve).



2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner states that the petitioner participated in the process of selection for recruitment to the post of Sub Inspector of Police services. The notification for recruitment was issued on 19.07.2006 and the notified vacancies were 682. The petitioner participated in the process of selection and proceeded in the selection process, subsequently he was appointed as Sub Inspector of Police and as of now, the petitioner is continuing in the post of Sub Inspector of Police.

3. The grievance of the writ petitioner is that one Mr.Alex, who also participated in the selection process along with the writ petitioner filed Writ Petition in W.P.No.4509 of 2009 and the matter was decided by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in W.A.Nos.1719 to 1739 of 2010 and an order was passed on 23.12.2010 and the said order of the Hon'ble Division Bench was implemented by the Government in G.O.Ms.No.399, Home (Police.3) Department, dated 07.06.2012. As per the G.O.Ms.No.399, the said Mr.Alex, who participated in the selection process along with the petitioner was granted two additional marks for the wrong key answers fixed in respect of the two questions. Thus, the petitioner also claims the same benefit for grant of marks for the wrong key answers. Therefore, the writ petitioner is also liable to get the same benefit on par with the said Mr.Alex. In other words, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner is of an opinion that Mr.Alex was granted two additional marks in respect of the wrong key answers and the writ petitioner was also eligible for grant of additional marks on account of the wrong key answers.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner further states that in the event of granting additional marks for the wrong key answers, the writ petitioner would be benefited in respect of his seniority in the post of Sub Inspector of Police. Thus, the petitioner is constrained to move the present Writ Petition.

5.The learned Additional Advocate General appearing on behalf of the respondents disputed the grounds raised on behalf of the writ petitioner by stating that the recruitment notification was issued in the year 2006 and the process of selection was completed and the candidates joined in the year 2007 and sent for Police training during the year 2008. They have successfully completed the training course and all the appointed candidates are serving as Sub Inspector of Police in various places. The claim of the writ petitioner cannot be considered after this length of time, in view of the fact that the case of the writ petitioner is not akin to the case of Mr.Alex. The petitioner was appointed as Sub Inspector of Police and was serving till now from the date of his



appointment and thereafter, filed the present writ petition seeking additional marks in respect of the wrong key answers. If at all, the writ petitioner is so aggrieved, he would have approached this Court immediately after the publication of the selection list. However, he had not done so and approached this Court belatedly.

6.This Court is of an opinion that the writ petitioner was selected and appointed to the post of Sub Inspector of Police. The age limit prescribed for appointment to the post of Sub Inspector of Police as per the recruitment notification was 28 years. Now, at this time, the writ petitioner would be more than 28 years. This apart in respect of grant of additional marks with reference to the wrong key answers, the petitioner ought to have approached this Court within a reasonable period of time. Admittedly, the petitioner was selected in the year 2007 and now serving as Sub Inspector of Police. He waited till the case of Mr.Alex reached its finality and thereafter, filed the present Writ Petition after a lapse of about five years from the date of selection. This apart, the Special Leave Petition filed by the candidates, challenging the order passed by the Division Bench in W.A.No.1729 of 2010 was dismissed by the Supreme Court of India on 19.01.2015 itself. Thus, the order passed by the Division Bench became final and accordingly, all the selected candidates are serving in the post of Sub Inspector of Police.

7.This being the factum of the case, the writ petitioner cannot claim any additional marks in respect of the selection conducted during the year 2007 and for the purpose of seniority. The ranking list published by the Department became final long back and the seniority also was fixed in accordance with the ranking list. Thus, the settled ranking list pursuant to the selection cannot be now unsettled after a lapse of more than six years from the date of selection. More specifically, the process of selection reached its finality in the year 2007 itself. In this view of the matter, the writ petitioner has not established any acceptable ground for the purpose of grant of relief as such sought for in this Writ Petition.

8.Accordingly, the writ petition stand dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (P&A)

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)



To

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Home Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 600 009.

2.Director General of Police (L&O),
Dr.Radhakrishnan Salai,
Mylapore, Chennai - 600 004.

3.Director General of Police / Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Uniformed Services,
Recruitment Board,
Anna Salai, Chennai - 600 002.

4.Public Information Officer /
Superintendent of Police,
Tamil Nadu Uniformed Services,
Recruitment Board,
Chennai - 600 002.

+1 CC to M/s.SPL GP (SR-83190[F] dated 22/08/2019)

+1 CC to M/s.S.M.MOHANGANDHI, Advocate (SR-83098[F] dated
22/08/2019)

W.P[MD]No.7131 of 2015
21.08.2019

_KM/ (21.10.2019) 4P 7C