



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 27.04.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P. (MD) No.15267 of 2020

and

W.M.P. (MD) Nos.12821 of 2020 & 14943 of 2021

WEB COPY

M.Sathish

... Petitioner

vs.

1.The Director General of Police-cum-Chairman

TNUSRB

Anna Salai, Chennai-600 002

2.The Director General of Police

Dr.Radhakrishnan Salai

Mylapore, Chennai-600 004

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ of mandamus directing the respondents to treat the petitioner's application bearing Enrolment Number 2610212 for the post of Sub-Inspector of Police for the year 2019 as being in order and proper under the 10% sports quota as regards the BC community irrespective of not mentioning the date of participation in Form-III sports certificate issued by Kalasalingam University to the petitioner thereby enabling the petitioner to participate in all eligible selection processes.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Rajaraman

For Respondents : Mr.Veera Kathiravan

Additional Advocate General
assisted by Mr.A.K.Manikkam
Special Government Pleader

O R D E R

The relief sought for in this writ petition is to direct the respondents to consider the petitioner's application for the post of Sub Inspector of Police for the year 2019.

2.Pursuant to the recruitment notification, the petitioner participated in the selection process for appointment to the post of Sub Inspector of Police under 10% Sports Quota. The petitioner is a graduate. He submitted application under the Sports Quota. He furnished a copy of the Sports Certificate issued by Kalasalingam University. However, in the certificate, the date of event was not mentioned. Therefore, the Authorities Competent granted time to the petitioner to get appropriate certificate in the prescribed format enabling them to consider the petitioner's application under the Sports Quota. Accordingly, the petitioner approached the University



and got a certificate on 21.09.2020, which categorically states that the petitioner participated in the South Zone Inter University Tournament held at University of Calicut, Kerala from 13.12.2014 to 20.12.2014. In view of the fact that the said certificate has also been produced, the case of the petitioner is to be considered.

WEB COPY

3.The learned Additional Advocate General objected the above contentions by stating that no doubt, the petitioner produced a certificate, which was not in the prescribed format. The date of event has not been mentioned in the certificate produced by the petitioner at the first instance. Thereafter, the petitioner produced another certificate, which reveals that the date of sports event was 24.12.2014. When the petitioner has mentioned clearly that the date of sports event was 24.12.2014, the Member-Secretary issued a letter, dated 19.02.2020, directing the petitioner to furnish a requisite certificate / document on or before 21.02.2020 enabling the Authorities to consider his case. The said letter was also communicated to the petitioner. It is further stated that the petitioner failed to send the requisite certificate to consider his case under Sports Quota. Thereafter, the petitioner approached the University and obtained a certificate dated 21.09.2020.

4.The learned Additional Advocate General made a further submission that the certificate first of all was not produced within the time limit granted by the Authorities vide letter dated 19.02.2020. The certificate itself was obtained only on 21.09.2020, after a lapse of seven months from the date of issuance of the letter by the competent Authority.

5.The learned counsel for the petitioner made a submission that due to Covid-19 situation and the University campus was being maintained as Covid Centre, the petitioner was unable to get the certificate immediately.

6.Beyond all these things, the learned Additional Advocate General pointed out that even as per the belated certificate issued by the University on 21.09.2020, the date of event was mentioned between 13.12.20214 to 20.12.2014. However, the petitioner in his application has stated the date of event as 24.12.2014 and the date of event is not matching and there is a discrepancy. Under those circumstances, the candidature of the petitioner was rejected.

7.This Court is of the considered opinion that if there is a discrepancy with reference to the date of event or participation of the petitioner in the sports event, then the case of the petitioner cannot be considered under Sports Quota. The candidates in clear terms must furnish the relevant documents at the time of submission of application. In the present case, while submitting application, the petitioner mentioned the date of event as 24.12.2014, however in the belated certificate it is mentioned that the event was held



between 13.12.2014 and 20.12.2014, which is not tallying with the date mentioned in the application. In view of such contradiction, the petitioner is not entitled to the relief as such sought for in this writ petition.

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

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (PROTOCOL)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

To:

1.The Director General of Police-cum-Chairman,
TNUSRB,
Anna Salai, Chennai-600 002.

2.The Director General of Police,
Dr.Radhakrishnan Salai,
Mylapore, Chennai-600 004.

+1 CC to M/s.R.RAJARAMAN, Advocate (SR-21658[F] dated 27/04/2022)

+1 CC to M/s.SPL.GP. (SR-22100[F] dated 28/04/2022)

W.P.(MD) No.15267 of 2020
and

W.M.P.(MD) Nos.12821 of 2020 & 14943 of 2021
27.04.2022

RS (06.05.2022) 3P-5C