



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 24.03.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P. (MD) No.2062 of 2022

and

W.M.P. (MD) No.3790 of 2022

WEB COPY

U.Muthuramalingam

... Petitioner

vs.

1.The Superintendent of Police
Tirunelveli District, Tirunelveli

2.The Tamiladu Uniformed
Services Recruitment Board
Chennai-600 008
rep.by its Member Secretary

3.The Director General of Police
Chennai-600 004

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ of certiorarified mandamus calling for the records relating to the proceedings of the 1st respondent dated 31.12.2021 made in Na.Ka.No.A4/31580/2020, quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to issue the appointment order to the petitioner for appointment to the post of Police Constable Grade-II in the common recruitment for the year 2020.


For Petitioner : Ms.C.Geetha
for Mr.Rajasekaran.K.

For Respondents : Mr.Veera Kathiravan
Additional Advocate General
assisted by Mr.A.K.Manikkam
Special Government Pleader

O R D E R

The order of rejection, dated 31.12.2021, passed by the first respondent, rejecting the candidature of the petitioner for recruitment to the post of Grade-II Police Constable, is under challenge in this writ petition.

2. The petitioner participated in the process of selection for recruitment to the post of Grade-II Police Constable and he was successful in the written examination and allowed to participate in the physical verification test and endurance test.



3. A criminal case was registered against the petitioner in Crime No.65 of 2018, on the file of Munneerpallam Police Station, under Sections 147, 341, 294(b) and 506(ii) I.P.C. The petitioner was arrested and subsequently, the case was ended in compromise and based on the compromise, Crl.O.P.(MD) No.3235 of 2018 filed by the petitioner was allowed on 07.03.2018.

4. This apart, the petitioner suppressed the fact regarding registration of the criminal case in the application form, but informed the same during verification. Therefore, the Selection Committee considered all the facts and formed an opinion that the petitioner is guilty of suppression of material fact regarding registration of criminal case. Further, the criminal case was quashed by this Court based on the compromise arrived at between the parties. Thus, the Committee found that the character and antecedents of the petitioner are not satisfactory.

5. This Court is of the considered opinion that nature of dispute is immaterial as far as the selection process is concerned. High Court cannot go into the nature of allegations in a criminal case as the decision of the Selection Committee in this regard became final.

6. Even recently, the Honourable Supreme Court of India in the case of **Commissioner of Police vs. Raj Kumar**, by Judgment dated 25.08.2021, passed in C.A.No.4960 of 2021, has held as follows:-

"26. Courts exercising judicial review cannot second guess the suitability of a candidate for any public office or post. Absent evidence of malice or mindlessness (to the materials), or illegality by the public employer, an intense scrutiny on why a candidate is excluded as unsuitable renders the courts' decision suspect to the charge of trespass into executive power of determining suitability of an individual for appointment. This was emphasized by this court, in M.V.Thimmaiah v. Union Public Service Commission [(2008) 2 SCC 119] held as follows:

"21. Now, comes the question with regard to the selection of the candidates. Normally, the recommendations of the Selection Committee cannot be challenged except on the ground of mala fides or serious violation of the statutory rules. The courts cannot sit as an Appellate Authority to examine the recommendations of the Selection Committee like the court of appeal. This discretion has been given to the Selection Committee only and courts



WEB COPY

rarely sit as a court of appeal to examine the selection of the candidates nor is the business of the court to examine each candidate and record its opinion...

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

30. We fail to understand how the Tribunal can sit as an Appellate Authority to call for the personal records and constitute Selection Committee to undertake this exercise. This power is not given to the Tribunal and it should be clearly understood that the assessment of the Selection Committee is not subject to appeal either before the Tribunal or by the courts. One has to give credit to the Selection Committee for making their assessment and it is not subject to appeal. Taking the overall view of ACRs of the candidates, one may be held to be very good and another may be held to be good. If this type of interference is permitted then it would virtually amount that the Tribunals and the High Courts have started sitting as Selection Committee or act as an Appellate Authority over the selection."

...

...

29. Public service - like any other, pre-supposes that the state employer has an element of latitude or choice on who should enter its service. Norms, based on principles, govern essential aspects such as qualification, experience, age, number of attempts permitted to a candidate, etc. These, broadly constitute eligibility conditions required of each candidate or applicant aspiring to enter public service. Judicial review, under the Constitution, is permissible to ensure that those norms are fair and reasonable, and applied fairly, in a non-discriminatory manner. However, suitability is entirely different; the autonomy or choice of the public employer, is greatest, as long as the



process of decision making is neither illegal, unfair, or lacking in bona fides.

30. The High Court's approach, evident from its observations about the youth and age of the candidates, appears to hint at the general acceptability of behaviour which involves petty crime or misdemeanour. The impugned order indicates a broad view, that such misdemeanour should not be taken seriously, given the age of the youth and the rural setting. This court is of opinion that such generalizations, leading to condonation of the offender's conduct, should not enter the judicial verdict and should be avoided. Certain types of offences, like molestation of women, or trespass and beating up, assault, causing hurt or grievous hurt, (with or without use of weapons), of victims, in rural settings, can also be indicative of caste or hierarchy-based behaviour. Each case is to be scrutinized by the concerned public employer, through its designated officials- more so, in the case of recruitment for the police force, who are under a duty to maintain order, and tackle lawlessness, since their ability to inspire public confidence is a bulwark to society's security."

7. This Court is of the considered opinion that the verification of suitability, eligibility and antecedents of the candidates are of paramount importance. The decision of the Selection Committee in this regard becomes final. High Court cannot interfere with the decision of the Selection Committee regarding the assessment of suitability, eligibility and verification of the antecedents. Hence, this Court do not find any infirmity in respect of the order impugned rejecting the candidature of the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-III)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar (CS)

krk



To:

1.The Superintendent of Police,
Tirunelveli District, Tirunelveli.

2.The Member Secretary,
Tamiladu Uniformed
Services Recruitment Board,
Chennai-600 008.

3.The Director General of Police,
Chennai-600 004.

+1 CC to M/s.SPL GP (SR-14904[F] dated 28/03/2022)

W.P. (MD) No.2062 of 2022
and
W.M.P. (MD) No.3790 of 2022
24.03.2022

RD(04.04.2022) 5P 5C