



WEB COPY

W.P.No. 21929 of 2017



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.10.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No. 21929 of 2017
and
W.M.P.No. 22975 of 2017

1. J. Raja
2. M. Saravanan
3. K.N. Varadarajan
4. V.M. Manimegalai
5. E.V. Geetha
6. G. Thulasi Raman
7. V. Asha
8. I. Vijayalakshmi
9. M. Govardanan
10. D. Gomathi

... Petitioners

Vs.

1. The District Collector
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.
2. The District Revenue Officer,
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the entire records in pursuant to the order passed in Na.Ka.No.11422/2017/A2 dated 23.06.2017 by the second respondent and quash the same and for a consequential direction to the respondents to permit the petitioners to undergo



firka Revenue Inspector Training for the remaining period of 4 months within a stipulated time to enable them to participate in the maintenance test conducted for promotion to the post of Deputy Tahsildar.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner	: Ms. N. Elakiya for Mr. T. Prabakaran
For Respondents	: Mr. S. Rajesh Government Advocate for R1 and R2

ORDER

The order impugned is a circular issued by the District Revenue Officer, Kanchipuram District, to all the Tahsildars and Sub Collectors and Revenue Divisional Officers at Kanchipuram District asking them to furnish the list of eligible employees in the cadre of Assistant.

2. In the circular, there is no mentioning about the preparation of panel or promotion to the eligible persons. The District Revenue Officer called for the particulars of the Assistants, who have completed two years of training from Tahsildars and Sub Collectors concerned. Mere issuance of circular in this regard would not provide a cause of action for the purpose of filing a writ petition. The circular cannot be considered as a grievance for the purpose of adjudication of issues. If at all the consideration for promotion to the petitioners was denied by the authorities and the juniors were considered,



then alone the petitioners have to approach the competent authorities or the court of law as the case may be. Contrarily, mere informing the list of names would not be construed as a grievance for the purpose of issuing a direction.

The grievances of the writ petitioners are that they were not permitted to undergo two years training period, which is a mandatory qualification for promotion to the post of Deputy Tahsildar. However, the said grievance is unconnected with the list of eligible Assistants, as called for by the District Revenue Officer in the impugned clarification dated 23.06.2017. Thus, the petitioners are at liberty to approach the competent authorities, if the promotions were granted in violation of the Rules and the seniority of the petitioners or otherwise.

3. With this liberty, the writ petition stands disposed of. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

19.10.2022

mrn
Index : Yes / No
Speaking order / Non-Speaking order



To

1. The District Collector
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.

2. The District Revenue Officer,
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.

W.P.No. 21929 of 20





WEB COPY

W.P.No. 21929 of 2017



S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

mrn

W.P.No. 21929 of 2017
and
W.M.P.No. 22975 of 2017

19.10.2022