



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 03.11.2020

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P. (MD)No.4099 of 2014

and

M.P(MD) .Nos.1 to 3 of 2014

WEB COPY

D.Chidambaram

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State rep. By the Secretary,
Secretariat,
Fort St.George,
Chennai.

2.The Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution
Corporation Lid.,
144, Anna Salai,
Chennai.

3.The Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
Chennai-22.

4.The Director of Technical Education,
Guindy,
Chennai.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records and quash the impugned list published by the respondent No.2 dated 24.02.2014 and directing the respondent No.2 to appoint the petitioner in the post of Technical Assistant/Electrical in the services of the respondent No.2.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Sekar

For R1 and R4 : Mr.C.M.Mari Chelliah Prabhu
Additional Government Pleader

For R2 and R3 : Mr.T.Sakthi Kumaran

ORDER

The selection list of 914 numbers of Technical Assistant (Electrical) and 50 numbers of Technical Assistant(Mechanical) is under challenge in the present writ petition.



2.The relief sought for is to quash the selection list published by the second respondent on 24.02.2014 and to direct the first respondent to appoint the petitioner in the post of Technical Assistant/Electrical. The writ petitioner participated in the process of selection for appointment to the post of Technical Assistant/Electrical. However, he was not selected. Thus, he challenged the entire selection list.

3.The entire selection list can be challenged on certain specific grounds. This apart, in the event of challenging the selection list of the selected candidates, who are all likely to be prejudiced, in the event of passing any order, are to be impleaded as parties in the writ petition. If a large number of candidates are selected then, the procedures contemplated under Rule 2(A) to Regulate Proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, are to be followed.

4.In the present case, none of the selected candidates are impleaded as respondents. Thus, quashing of the selection list in entirety cannot be entertained in the present writ petition. This apart, the writ petitioner seeks a direction to appoint him and such a direction cannot be granted in the absence of establishing any illegality or corrupt practice in the matter of selection. The writ petitioner states that the marks awarding system is improper. He is questioning the method of recruitment. Once the petitioner participated in the process of selection and the selection list was published and he was unsuccessful, then he cannot question the process of selection, which was already completed. This being the principles should be followed. The petitioner has not established any acceptable legal grounds for the purpose of considering the relief as such sought for in the present writ petition.

5.This apart, the selection process was made in the year 2013-2014 and the selected candidates are appointed and working for the past six years. Thus, the writ petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar ()

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Ns

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



To

1.The Secretary,
Secretariat,
Fort St.George,
Chennai.

2.The Director of Technical Education,
Guindy,
Chennai.

+1 CC to Mr.T. SAKTHIKUMARAN, Advocate (SR-21045[F] dated
04/11/2020)

+1 CC to SGP (SR-21120[F] dated 04/11/2020)

W.P. (MD)No.4099 of 2014

and

M.P(MD) .Nos.1 to 3 of 2014

03.11.2020

PM(CO)

KM (11.11.2020) 3P 5C