



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16.02.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.VAIDYANATHAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MOHAMMED SHAFFIQ

W.A.No.1557 of 2018
and
CMP.No.12575 of 2018

Government of Tamil Nadu
Rep.by its Secretary
Youth Welfare and Sports Development (S1) Department,
Chennai - 9. ...Appellant/1st Respondent

Vs

1. L.Vinayaga Moorthy ...1st Respondent/Respondent
2. Sports Development Authority of Tamil Nadu
Rep.by its Member Secretary,
Chennai - 600 084. ...Respondents/2nd Respondent

Prayer:Writ Appeal is filed under clause 15 of the Letter Patent praying to allow the Writ Appeal and set aside the order made in W.P No.25611 of 2015 by the order dated in 18.10.2016.

Prayer in W.P No.25611 of 2015: Praying for issuing Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to regularize the services of the petitioner from the date of initial appointment with all attendant benefits.

For Appellant : Mr.U.M. Ravichandran
Spl.Govt.Pleader

For Respondents: No appearance

JUDGMENT

The present appeal has been preferred against the order of the learned Single Judge dated 18.10.2016 in W.P.No.25611 of 2015.

2.When the matter is taken up for hearing, the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the appellant submitted



that the issue is covered by the decision of this Court dated 06.08.2018 rendered in W.A.No.1954 of 2019 dated 27.06.2019, in which it was observed as follows:-

“4.It is not in dispute that there are several posts of coach and especially Coach (Hockey) in the Sports Development Authority of Tamil Nadu. Even according to the State, they are in the process of making appointments. Such being the factual position, the learned single Judge was justified in directing the appellant to consider the question of regularisation of the first respondent. In fact, the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition also contain an averment that the first respondent possess the qualification for the posts of Coach (Hockey). The learned single Judge has not issued any positive direction. The only direction is to consider the case of regularisation taking into account the earlier service from 15.12.2004. We are of the view that there is absolutely no merit in the contention taken by the appellant”.

3.In the present case on hand, taking note of the fact that the issue is already covered by the decision of this Court dated 27.06.2019 with regard to consideration of appointment under Sports Quota, the case of the writ petitioner needs to be considered in the similar line.

4.In the result, the Writ Appeal stands dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS III)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

dpq

To

The Member Secretary,
Sports Development Authority of Tamilnadu,
Chennai - 84.

+1cc to Mr.K.Azhagu Raman, Advocate, S.R.No.10688

+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.10286

W.A.No.1557 of 2018

SVI (CO)
RGA(08/03/2022)