



W.P. No. 25597 of 2016

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.07.2022

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.D. AUDIKESAVALU

**W.P. No. 25597 of 2016
and
W.M.P. No. 21961 of 2016**

R.Stephenson

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
rep. by its Secretary,
Higher Education Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Director of Collegiate Education,
College Road,
Chennai – 600 006.
3. The Joint Director of Collegiate Education,
Tirunelveli Region,
Tirunelveli – 627 007.
4. Nesamony Memorial Christian College,
rep. by its Secretary-cum-Correspondent,
Marthandam,
Kanyakumari District – 629 165.
5. Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
rep. by its Registrar,
Abishekapatti,
Tirunelveli – 627 012.
6. Dr. A.Sajan

... Respondents



W.P. No. 25597 of 2016

Prayer:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the proceedings of the Second Respondent vide Na. Ka. No. 5609/F2/2015 culminating in his order dated 16.10.2015, quash the same and consequently direct the Second Respondent to approve the appointment of the Petitioner as Lecturer in Tamil in the Fourth Respondent College, with effect from 19.09.2003 instead of 30.07.2007 with all monetary benefits.

For Petitioner : Ms. W.R.Subhashini

For Respondents : Mr. V.Jeevagiridharan,
Additional Government Pleader
(for R1 to R3)

Mr. C.Robert Bruce (for R4)

Mr. S.Nambiarooran
for M/s. Ajmal Associates (for R5)

Mr. P.Samjapa Singh (for R6)

ORDER

Heard Ms. W.R.Subhashini, Learned Counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. V.Jeevagiridharan, Learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the First to Third Respondents, Mr. C.Robert Bruce, Learned Counsel for the Fourth Respondent, Mr. S.Nambiarooran, Learned Counsel for the Fifth



W.P. No. 25597 of 2016

Respondent and Mr. P.Samjapa Singh, Learned Counsel for the Sixth

Respondent and perused the materials placed on record, apart from the pleadings of the parties.

2. The Writ Petition has been filed challenging the proceedings in Na. Ka. No. 5609/F2/2015 dated 16.10.2015 passed by the Second Respondent and to consequently direct the Second Respondent to approve the appointment of the Petitioner as Lecturer in Tamil in the college of the Fourth Respondent with effect from 19.09.2003 instead of 30.07.2007 with all monetary benefits.

3. It is not in dispute that the College of the Fourth Respondent in which the Petitioner is working is located within the territorial limits of jurisdiction of the Madurai Bench of this Court. The only reason stated for having approached the Principal Seat of this Court instead of approaching the Madurai Bench of this Court is that the office of the First and Second Respondents are situated at Chennai within the territorial limits of jurisdiction of the Principal Seat of this Court. There cannot be any doubt that the First and Second Respondents exercise powers for the whole of the State of Tamil Nadu, but that cannot be said to mean as if the cause of action arises within the territorial limits of jurisdiction of the Principal Seat of this Court.



W.P. No. 25597 of 2016

WEB COPY

4. In this context, reference may be made to the decision of the Division Bench of this Court in ***C.Ramesh -vs- Director General of Police, Chennai*** (Order dated 06.06.2013 in W.P. (MD) No. 8790 of 2013), in which it has been held as follows:-

"7. *Exercise of jurisdiction is based on arising of the cause of action, either in whole or in part in any one of the said Revenue Districts. [See RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT ADVOCATES' ASSOCIATION Vs. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS (2001 (2) SCC 294) and B.STALIN Vs. THE REGISTRAR, SUPREME COURT OF INDIA AND OTHERS (2012 (3) LW 489 (FB))].*

8. *It should be remembered that the part of cause of action must be substantial in nature. The territorial jurisdiction of the Court is linked with the place of accrual of cause of action. [See U.P. RASHTRIYA CHINI MILL ADHIKARI PARISHAD, LUCKNOW Vs. STATE OF U.P. AND OTHERS (1995 (4) SCC 738)].*

9. *Referring to KUSUM INGOTS & ALLOYS LTD. Vs. UNION OF INDIA (2004 (3) CTC 365), a Full Bench of this Court in SANJOS JEWELLERS Vs. SYNDICATE BANK, BANGALORE*



W.P. No. 25597 of 2016

WEB COPY

AND OTHERS (2007 (5) CTC 305), held as under:- "30. We must, however, remind ourselves that even if a small part of cause of action arises within the territorial jurisdiction of the High Court, the same by itself may not be considered to be a determinative factor compelling the High Court to decide the matter on merit. In appropriate cases, the Court may refuse to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction by invoking the Doctrine of forum conveniens. [See BHAGAT SINGH BUGGA Vs. DEWAN JAGBIR SAWHNEY, AIR 1941 CAL 670 : ILR (1941) 1 CAL 490; MADANLAL JALAN Vs. MADANLAL, 1945 (49) CWN 357; AIR 1949 CAL 495; BHARAT COKING COAL LTD. Vs. JHARIA TALKIES & COLD STORAGE (P) LTD., 1997 CWN 122; S.S.JAIN & CO. Vs. UNION OF INDIA, 1994 (1) CHN 445, and NEW HORIZONS LTD. Vs. UNION OF INDIA, AIR 1994 DEL 126].

10. Question of entertaining a lis disclosing a cause of action or part of cause of action is based on the averments contained in the affidavit etc. At that stage, the truth or otherwise of the averments need not be gone into. But, there must be necessary averments disclosing a cause of action, so that the Court can take



W.P. No. 25597 of 2016

WEB COPY

cognizance of/entertaining the lis exposed in the petition for taking further action. [See OIL AND NATURAL GAS COMMISSION Vs. UTPAL KUMAR BASU AND OTHERS (1994 (4) SCC 711)]

11. A Court cannot arrogate/assume/confer upon itself a jurisdiction- territorial jurisdiction, when it has no such jurisdiction. Lack of jurisdiction to entertain a matter goes to the root of the matter, otherwise whatever action taken or orders passed by the Court becomes a nullity, it is non est and of no consequence at all resulting in wasting of precious public time. Courts are barred from indulging in hypothetic and academic exercises."

Having regard to the aforesaid legal position, viz-a-viz, factual matrix of this case, the cause of action for the Writ Petition, viz., challenging the proceedings in Na. Ka. No. 5609/F2/2015 dated 16.10.2015 passed by the Second Respondent and to consequently direct the Second Respondent to approve the appointment of the Petitioner as Lecturer in Tamil in the college of the Fourth Respondent with effect from 19.09.2003 instead of 30.07.2007 with all monetary benefits, would have to be necessarily construed as having arisen wholly within the territorial limits of jurisdiction of the Madurai Bench of this



W.P. No. 25597 of 2016

Court, notwithstanding that the office of the First and Second Respondents are located in Chennai.

5. When it is pointed out that the Writ Petition cannot be entertained in the Principal Seat of this Court in that backdrop, Learned Counsel for the Petitioner seeks permission of the Court to withdraw this Writ Petition with liberty to file fresh Writ Petition for the same relief before the Madurai Bench of this Court and she has made an endorsement to that effect in the court record.

In fine, the Writ Petition is dismissed as withdrawn granting such liberty. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed. No costs.

11.07.2022
2/2

gd

Index: Yes/No

Note: Issue order copy by 25.07.2022.

To

1. The Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
Higher Education Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.



W.P. No. 25597 of 2016

2. The Director of Collegiate Education,
College Road,
Chennai – 600 006.
3. The Joint Director of Collegiate Education,
Tirunelveli Region,
Tirunelveli – 627 007.
4. The Secretary-cum-Correspondent,
Nesamony Memorial Christian College,
Marthandam,
Kanyakumari District – 629 165.
5. The Registrar,
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Abishekapatti,
Tirunelveli – 627 012.



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 25597 of 2016

P.D. AUDIKESAVALU, J.

gd

W.P. No. 25597 of 2016

11.07.2022

2/2