



WEB COPY



W.P.No.5017 of 2016

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :10.11.2022

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.5017 of 2016

S.Lakshmi

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
School Education Department,
Secretariat, Chennai- 600 009.
2. The Director of Elementary Education,
College Road, Chennai-600 006.
3. The District Elementary Educational Officer ,
Office of the District Collector Campus,
Salem-636 001, Salem District.
4. The Additional Assistant Elementary ,
Educational Officer, Kadaiyampatti-636 351,
Salem District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records pertaining to the order passed by the 3rd Respondent in his proceedings Na.Ka. No. 4546/A3/2015 dated 07.12.2015 and quash the same, and direct the Respondents to regularize the service period of the petitioner from 21.01.1991 to 04.07.1993 and to prepone the Selection Grade in the



W.P.No.5017 of 2016

year 1999 instead of 2000 and to disburse the service benefits and pension etc.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Ganesan for
Mr.K.Premnath

For Respondents : Mrs.S.Mythreye Chandru
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

The order of rejection rejecting the claim of the writ petitioner to regularise the service period from 21.01.1991 to 04.07.1993 in proceeding dated 07.12.2015, is under challenge in the present writ petition.

2. The writ petitioner Tmt.S.Lakshmi was appointed as Secondary Grade Assistant on 01.09.1989, thereafter she was promoted up to the level of Selection Grade on 15.11.2000 in the cadre of Secondary Grade Teacher, and was permitted to retire from service on 31.05.2008, on attaining the age of superannuation.

3. The petitioner states that while she was working as a Secondary Grade Assistant, a transfer proceeding was initiated against her and she was terminated from service. She filed an application before the Tamil



W.P.No.5017 of 2016

Nadu Administrative Tribunal in O.A.No.1204 of 1991 and the Tribunal granted an interim stay. However, the said original application was subsequently transferred before the High Court and was allowed in the year 2008.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner was not permitted to join duty from the year 1991 to 1993, despite the fact that an interim stay granted by the Tamil Nadu Administrative Tribunal was in force.

5. The learned Special Government Pleader, appearing on behalf of the respondents disputed the said contentions by stating that the petitioner had not joined duty during the relevant point of time since she was transferred to some other place, and therefore, the claim of the petitioner was rejected by the department. However, several years lapsed and admittedly, the petitioner retired from service on 31.05.2008. Even at the time of filing the present writ petition, she was aged about 68 years.

6. Lapsed claims cannot be restored after several years. In the present case, for the purpose of restoring the lapsed claim, the writ



W.P.No.5017 of 2016

petitioner filed a separate writ petition in W.P.No.29978 of 2015 and obtained an order to consider his representation and pass orders. By virtue of the said order, issued by the High Court on 23.09.2015, the impugned order has been passed by the respondents in proceeding dated 07.12.2015.

7. There is a growing practice that the litigants, after a lapse of several years, are sending blanket representations to the authorities and filing a writ petition with the prayer to consider the representation. The High Court is also issuing directions to consider the representation and the authorities are forced to pass orders on merits. Such orders are taken by way of another writ petition and in such manner, the cause of action is restored after several years.

8. Such a practice is unconstitutional and results on account of issuing routine orders of direction to consider the representation. Even for issuing a direction to consider the representation, the rights of the parties have to be established and the issues have to be adjudicated. Contrarily, merely issuing a direction would do no service to the cause of justice and the litigant will be back again with another writ petition and when such writ petitions are admitted and taken up for hearing after



W.P.No.5017 of 2016

several years, it is found that the dead cause of actions are restored and there is no record available even for adjudication on merits.

9. In the present case, the petitioner claims that the period of service from 1991-93 is to be regularized and she filed an original application before the Tribunal which was disposed of long back. The petitioner retired from service on 31.05.2008 itself and thereafter, she filed a fresh writ petition in the year 2015 and obtained an order of direction to consider her representation.

10. Such a method of restoration of the cause of action is to be deprecated and this Court is of the considered opinion that the claim has lapsed long back and the principle of laches would apply in this case. Therefore, this Court does not find any infirmity in respect of the order passed and therefore, the writ petition is devoid of merits and thus stands **dismissed**. There shall be no order as to costs.

Index : Yes
Speaking order
sha

10.11.2022
(3/3)



W.P.No.5017 of 2016

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM.J.,

sha

To

1. The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by its Secretary to Government,
School Education Department,
Secretariat, Chennai- 600 009.
2. The Director of Elementary Education,
College Road, Chennai-600 006.
3. The District Elementary Educational Officer ,
Office of the District Collector Campus,
Salem-636 001, Salem District.
4. The Additional Assistant Elementary ,
Educational Officer,
Kadaiyampatti-636 351,
Salem District.

W.P.No.5017 of 2016

**10.11.2022
(3/3)**