



WEB COPY

W.P.(MD)No.3437 of 2017

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 15.11.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

W.P.(MD)No.3437 of 2017

and

W.M.P.(MD)Nos.2790 and 2791 of 2017

Ramamoorthi

... Petitioner

vs.

1.Tamil Nadu Uniformed Services Recruitment Board,
Represented by its Chairman,
Anna Salai, Chennai-600 002.

2.The Director,
Tamil Nadu Uniformed Services Recruitment Board,
No.807, P.T.Lee. Chengalvaraya Naicker Maaligai,
Anna Salai, Chennai-2.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned notification published by the 1st respondent on 23.01.2017 for the selection of Grade-II Police Constable and to quash the same as illegal and



W.P.(MD)No.3437 of 2017

WEB COPY

unconstitutional and consequently, to direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to write the examination to be held on 21.05.2017.

For Petitioner : No appearance
For Respondents : Mr.Veera Kathiravan
Additional Advocate General
assisted by Mr.P.Thambidurai
Government Advocate

ORDER

This writ petition is filed for issuance of a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to quash the impugned notification published by the 1st respondent on 23.01.2017 for the selection of Grade-II Police Constable and consequently, to direct the respondents to permit the petitioner to write the examination to be held on 21.05.2017.

2. The claim of the writ petition is that the date of age limit, that is prescribed in the notification is erroneous. Since the notification was issued on




W.P.(MD)No.3437 of 2017

WEB COPY

23.01.2017 that date should be taken into consideration. The petitioner has not stated any sustainable legal ground to interfere. When the notification specifically states that as on 01.07.2017, the candidate should have completed 18 years of age, that too it is specifically stated that as on 01.07.1999, the candidate should have born on 01.07.1999 or prior to that date. When the notification specifically prescribes the date as cutoff date, that date would prevail. If the notification is not stating any such cutoff date, then the date of notification will be taken into account.

3.In the present case, when the notification specifically prescribes a cutoff date, that would prevail and the case of the petitioner cannot be considered. This issue was already considered by this Court in W.P.(MD)Nos.2455, 4574 and 4960 of 2017, dated 25.04.2017 and the relevant portion of the order is extracted here under:

“10.In view of the principles of law reiterated by the Hon'ble



4. When the recruitment authority has prescribed certain conditions by prescribing date in the impugned notification which is a policy decision of the Government, the same cannot be interfered with. Hence, the petitioner has not raised any sustainable legal grounds. Hence, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

15.11.2022
(3/6)

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.3437 of 2017

To

- 1.Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Uniformed Services Recruitment Board,
Anna Salai, Chennai-600 002.
- 2.The Director,
Tamil Nadu Uniformed Services Recruitment Board,
No.807, P.T.Lee. Chengalvaraya Naicker Maaligai,
Anna Salai, Chennai-2.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.3437 of 2017

S.SRIMATHY, J

Tmg

W.P.(MD)No.3437 of 2017

15.11.2022
(3/6)