



W.P.No.31137 of 2017

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.10.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.31137 of 2017
and W.M.P.Nos.34157 & 34158 of 2017

M.Amudha

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Collector,
Dharmapuri District,
Dharmapuri.

2.The Commissioner/Block Development Officer,
Kaarimangalam Union,
Dharmapuri District.

3.Girija Mahendran

...Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to order passed by the 1st respondent vide his proceedings in Na.Ka. No.1521/2016/ XI dated 13.11.2017 and quash the appointment of the 3rd respondent as illegal, incompetent and ultravires and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd



W.P.No.31137 of 2017

respondents to appoint the petitioner in the place of the 3rd respondent.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Jayaprakash

For Respondents : Mr.V.Arun
Additional Advocate General

assisted by
Mr.R.P.Murugan Raja
Government Advocate for R1

Mr.V.Jayaprakash Narayanan for R2

ORDER

The appointment of the 3rd respondent as Noon Meal Organizer in proceeding dated 13.11.2017 is sought to be quashed.

2.The petitioner states that she had participated in the process of selection and submitted all the relevant documents before the Selection Committee. The contention of the petitioner is that the 3rd respondent who is not eligible and over aged was appointed as Noon Meal Organizer in violation of the Government Orders in force. The petitioner states that she is aged about 21 years and the 3rd respondent has crossed the age limit



W.P.No.31137 of 2017

WEB COPY

contemplated in the Government guidelines. Thus, the order of appointment is liable to be set aside.

3.The learned Additional Advocate General appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 and 2 brought to the notice of this Court that as per Government Order issued in G.O.Ms.No.163, dated 18.08.2010, the maximum age limit fixed for appointment to the post of Noon Meal Organizer is 40 years. The petitioner was aged about 21 years and the 3rd respondent was aged about 38 years. Thus, the 3rd respondent is also eligible for appointment and the contention of the petitioner that the 3rd respondent is over aged is incorrect.

4.In view of the fact that both the petitioner and the 3rd respondent are residing within the radius of 3 Kms from the Noon Meal Centre and the 3rd



W.P.No.31137 of 2017

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

ssr

respondent is within the age limit as the Government Orders in force, there is no infirmity in respect of the selection and appointment of the 3rd respondent to the post of Noon Meal Organizer. Thus, the writ petition is devoid of merits and stands dismissed. No Costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

26.10.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
Speaking order : Yes / No
ssr

To

- 1.The District Collector,
Dharmapuri District, Dharmapuri.
- 2.The Commissioner/Block Development Officer,
Kaarimangalam Union, Dharmapuri District.

W.P.No.31137 of 2017
and W.M.P.Nos.34157 & 34158 of 2017