



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 04.01.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH

W.P. (MD) No.19772 of 2020

Mohamed Eirsath

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Director General of Police,
Office of the Director General of Police,
Mylapore, Chennai - 600 004.

2.The Superintendent of Police,
Sivagangai District,
Sivagangai - 630 562.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to fix petitioner's salary and seniority including the petitioner's name in 'C' list on par with other directly recruited Sub-Inspectors of Police (Taluk) for the year 2006 by considering the petitioner's representation dated 07.12.2020.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Baalasundharam

For Respondents : Mr.A.Muthukaruppan

Additional Government Pleader


O R D E R

This writ petition has been filed for issuance of writ of mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to fix petitioner's salary and seniority including the petitioner's name in 'C' list on par with other directly recruited Sub-Inspectors of Police (Taluk) for the year 2006 by considering the petitioner's representation dated 07.12.2020.

2.Mr.A.Muthu Karuppan, learned Additional Government Pleader, takes notice on behalf of the respondents.

3.By consent of both parties, this writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

4.The limited grievance of the petitioner is that the first respondent has not fixed the petitioner's salary and seniority including the petitioner's name in the 'C' list, on par with other directly recruited Sub Inspector of Police (Taluk), for the year 2006. In this connection, the petitioner had already given a representation dated 17.12.2020 to the first respondent, ventilating his grievance and since the representation has not been considered till date, the present writ petition has been filed.



5.In my view, the representation is self explanatory ventilating the grievance of the petitioner and that the first respondent would be the proper Authority to consider the same. Hence, this Court would not be justified in stepping into the shoes of the first respondent for the purpose of considering the representation. However, if the first respondent is permitted to consider the representation of the petitioner within a stipulated time, the petitioner's grievance could be met and thereby the ends of justice could be secured.

6.In the light of the above observations, there shall be a direction to the first respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 17.12.2020, on his own merits and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

7.This writ petition stands disposed of accordingly. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS I)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

TM

Note: In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the Advocate/litigant concerned.

To

1.The Director General of Police,
Office of the Director General of Police,
Mylapore, Chennai - 600 004.

2.The Superintendent of Police,
Sivagangai District,
Sivagangai - 630 562.

+1 CC to M/s.GP (SR-90[F] dated 05/01/2021)

+1 CC to M/s.K.BAALA SUNDHARAM, Advocate (SR-8[F] dated
04/01/2021)

W.P. (MD) No.19772 of 2020

04.01.2021

PU(CO)

KK(19.01.2021) 2P 5C

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