



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10.07.2023

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R.SURESH KUMAR
AND
THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE K.KUMARESH BABU

W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

W.A.No.692 of 2014:

1.T.Rex

2.G.Balaguru

... Appellants

Vs.

1.R.Sakthivel

2.A.Bharathi Bakkiyam

3.S.Nandhakumar

4.M.Dinesh

5.The Tamil Nadu Electricity Board

Rep. By its Chairman

Anna Salai, Chennai – 2.

6.Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution

Corporation, Rep. By the Chairman/Managing Director,

Head Quarters Complex,

144 Anna Salai, Chennai – 2.



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

7.K.Vivek

8.M.Jagadeesh

9.K.P.Nharen

10.S.Navaneetha Krishnan

11.S.Sivaraman

... Respondents

Prayer : Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent Act, against the order dated 23.04.2014 in W.P.No.26692 of 2013 passed by this Court.

For Appellants : Mrs.AL.Gandhimathi
Senior Counsel
for Ms.Meenakshi

For Respondents : Mr.K.Rajkumar, TNEB for R5 & R6

: No appearance
for R1 to R4 and R7 to R11

W.A.No.693 of 2014:

1.T.Rex

2.G.Balaguru

... Appellants

Vs.

1.S.Arthi

2.S.Govindasamy

2/30



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

3.R.Vijayakumar

4.P.M.Rajah

5.The Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
Rep. By its Chairman
Anna Salai, Chennai – 2.

6.Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution
Corporation, Rep. By the Chairman/Managing Director,
Head Quarters Complex,
144 Anna Salai, Chennai – 2.

7.K.Vivek

8.M.Jagadeesh

9.K.P.Nharen

10.S.Navaneetha Krishnan

11.S.Sivaraman

... Respondents

Prayer : Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent Act, against the order dated 23.04.2014 in W.P.No.29841 of 2013 passed by this Court.

For Appellants : Mrs.AL.Gandhimathi
Senior Counsel
for Ms.Meenakshi

For Respondents : Mr.K.Rajkumar, TNEB for R5 & R6

: No appearance
for R2 to R4 and R7 to R11



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

W.A.No.694 of 2014:

1.T.Rex
2.G.Balaguru

... Appellants

Vs.

1. M.Mohammed Arshad
- 2 J.K.Ananthi
- 3 S.Kubersha
- 4 V.Manikandan
- 5 R.Parimalam
- 6 K.Prathap
- 7 S.Elizabeth Jeba Komari
- 8 K.P.Meena
- 9 S.Lakshmi
- 10 J.Chandrasekaran
- 11 M.Kavimani
- 12 P.Sivakumar
- 13 P.Maheshwaran
- 14 K.Prithiviraj
- 15 N.Murugadoss
- 16 P.Kathirvel
- 17 V.Akkandi
- 18 V.Vigneshwaran
- 19 M.Purushothaman
- 20 P.Kalimuthu
- 21 A.Jeyabalan
- 22 P.Mohan kumar
- 23 E.Citrarasu
- 24 S.Kalaiyaran
- 25 C.Sivasakthi
- 26 D.Manju
- 27 D.Puhazhendiran
- 28 K.Rajesh
- 29 S.Tamilneedhi
- 30 S.Shalini



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

- 31 M.Mohankumar
- 32 S.Siva
- 33 M.Selladurai
- 34 S.Sudha
- 35 R.Deepak
- 36 R.Bhavya
- 37 A.Sathya
- 38 S.N.Gopala Krishnan
- 39 S.Venkateswaran
- 40 A.Mohammed Ismail
- 41 M.Suresh
- 42 S.Arun Kumar
- 43 S.Charayana
- 44 A.Brinda
- 45 P.Sivaraj
- 46 H.Kishor kumar
- 47 B.GOpalakrishnan
- 48 P.Gopinathan
- 49 L.Saravana Kumar
- 50 V.Shanmugamoorthi
- 51 A.Sonia
- 52 M.Anandakumar
- 53 G.Dinesh
- 54 M.Mohan
- 55 R.Balaji
- 56 A.Senthil Kumar
- 57 K.S.Gowthaman
- 58 S.Vinolia Stephna
- 59 R.Vidhya
- 60 A.Archana
- 61 D.Mailvannan
- 62 M.Karthick
- 63 K.Kannan
- 64 P.Sivakumar
- 65 M.Jegan
- 66 P.Dhanraj



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

67 V.John Selvakumar

68 J. Dhanasekaran

69 K.Antony Prakash

70 N.Reshma

71 G.Christ Jose

72.The Chairman cum Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution
Corporation Limited,
144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.

73.The Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution
Corporation Limited,
Rep. By its Secretary,
144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.

74.The Chief Engineer/Personnel,
Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution
Corporation Limited,
144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.

... Respondents

Prayer : Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent Act, against the
order dated 23.04.2014 in W.P.No.30954 of 2013 passed by this Court.

For Appellants : Mrs.AL.Gandhimathi, Senior Counsel
for Ms.Meenakshi

For Respondents : Mr.K.Rajkumar, TNEB for R72 to R74

: No appearance

For RR.1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 to 16, 18 to 22,
25 to 41, 43, 45 to 65, 67 to 71

: For RR 5, 8, 17, 23, 24 and 42 Unclaimed

: For 44 – Deceased

: For R66 – Left



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

COMMON JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by R.SURESH KUMAR, J.)

These writ appeals have been directed against the common order passed by the Writ Court in W.P.Nos.26692, 29841 and 30954 of 2013 dated 23.04.2014.

2. The short facts which are required to be noticed for the disposal of these writ appeals are as follows:

2.1. The private respondents herein in these appeals were the writ petitioners who filed the aforestated respective writ petitions. The reason for filing such writ petitions was that, those writ petitioners were the Engineering graduates in Electrical Engineering. The respondent TANGEDCO issued a Notification on 26.05.2013 inviting applications from eligible candidates to fill up the post of Assistant Engineer (Electrical) 200 numbers, Assistant Engineer (Mechanical) 50 numbers and Assistant Engineer (Civil) 25 numbers. It is to be noted that, those who completed one year Apprenticeship Training at the respondent TANGEDCO alone could be eligible to make an application to participate at the selection process for



the appointment to the post of Assistant Engineer in the three streams viz.,
Electrical, Mechanical and Civil.

WEB COPY

2.2. As far as the *lis* before us is concerned, it is submitted by the learned counsel for both sides that, this relates to the Assistant Engineer (Electrical) for which 200 posts have been earmarked.

2.3. As per the said notification dated 26.05.2013, a cut-off date has been prescribed as 03.06.2013, on or before those who completed the one year Apprenticeship Training at the TANGEDCO alone would be entitled to make an application and registered for participation in the selection process.

2.4. As far as the said notification is concerned, the selection process, according to the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the TANGEDCO is that, those eligible applicants would be called for interview and in the interview the *inter se* merit would be evaluated and based on the interview, performance would be evaluated and selection would be made.



WEB COPY

2.5. While that being the position, the writ petitioners who are private respondents herein are concerned, though they had the qualification of Engineering graduation in Electrical and had undergone the Apprenticeship Training on the particular date i.e. 03.06.2013 and they had completed one year Apprenticeship Training, therefore in order to consider their candidature also they approached this Court and filed those writ petitions seeking for writ of mandamus.

2.6. During the pendency of those writ petitions, it seems that, interim order had been passed directing the TANGEDCO to permit those writ petitioners also to participate in the interview to be conducted in this regard. Thereafter, the TANGEDCO had come forward to issue an Additional Notification dated 27.09.2013 under which not only the writ petitioners but also who are all the eligible applicants who completed the one year Apprenticeship Training given by the TANGEDCO would become eligible to register and participate in the selection process by attending the interview which was slated to be conducted between 18.11.2013 and 21.11.2013. The relevant notification dated 27.09.2013 reads thus:



TAMIL NADU GENERATION AND DISTRIBUTION CORPORATION LTD.

NOTICE

The Interview will be conducted in the following dates for the post of 200 Assistant Engineer / Electrical, 50 Assistant Engineer/Mechanical and 25 Assistant Engineer/Civil by Direct Recruitment - 2013.

Sl. No	Name of the post	Name of the Centre	Interview Date
1.	Assistant Engineer/Civil	O/o TNEB Head Quarters, 144, Anna Salai, Chennai - 2.	18.11.2013
2.	Assistant Engineer/Mech.	O/o TNEB Head Quarters, 144, Anna Salai, Chennai - 2.	18.11.13 and 19.11.13
3.	Assistant Engineer/Elect.	O/o TNEB Head Quarters, 144, Anna Salai, Chennai - 2.	21.11.13 to 23.11.13
4.	Assistant Engineer/Elect.	O/o CE/Distribution/Trichy Region/TANGEDCO/Thennur Highways Road, Trichy. 620017	21.11.13 to 22.11.13
5.	Assistant Engineer/Elect.	O/o CE/Distribution/Villupuram Region/TANGEDCO/Villupuram 605 602	21.11.13 to 23.11.13
6.	Assistant Engineer/Elect.	O/o CE/Distribution/Coimbatore Region/TANGEDCO/TATA BAD Combatore 641 012.	21.11.13 to 23.11.13
7.	Assistant Engineer/Elect.	O/o CE/Distribution/Madurai Region/TANGEDCO/K. Pudur, Madurai. 625 007.	21.11.13 to 22.11.13
8.	Assistant Engineer/Elect.	O/o CE/Distribution/Tirunelveli Region/TANGEDCO/Maha Raja Nagar, Tirunelveli. 627 061	21.11.13 to 22.11.13

Hence, it is notified that all graduate engineers who have completed one year apprenticeship at TANGEDCO / TANTRANSCO before the date of interview may attend interview in their respective Regions/nearly centres on the above dates where they have completed the apprenticeship in the respective branch. They shall bring the training completion certificate issued by TANGEDCO/TANTRANSCO at the time of interview. In this regard, it is informed that their admission to the interview will be subject to the out come of the W.P.No. 26692 of 2013 pending before the High Court of Madras. It is informed that this is only call letter for interview and verification of testimonials and certificates and does not carry with it any commitment for selection or appointment.



2.7. By virtue of the second notification dated 27.09.2013 ,the writ petitioners also become eligible to participate in the interview, accordingly they participated in the interview.

2.8. Ultimately based on the performance of the writ petitioners and others, which, according to the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the TANGEDCO, 4000 + applicants who were called for interview, the *inter se* merit among them were evaluated and ultimately for filling up the 200 posts in Electrical Branch, 182 were selected including majority of the writ petitioners.

2.9. At that time the writ petitions came up for final hearing on 23.04.2014, where, it was informed to the Writ Court that, during the pendency of the writ petitions, the second notification dated 27.09.2013 was issued making all those who completed one year training before the interview date become eligible to participate in the interview. By virtue of that all the writ petitioners participated in the interview, pursuant to which, after evaluation the final selection list for 182 Assistant Engineers (Electrical) had been made and it was made ready.



WEB COPY

2.10. These aspects had been taken note of by the learned Judge and after having recorded these developments, the learned Judge passed the following order:

“15. In addition thereto, the respondents Electricity Board have also issued notification dated 26.05.2013 in a daily news 'Deccan Chronicle', calling upon the Engineering Graduates, who have completed one year apprenticeship training in TANGEDCO / TNEB, to register their names at the office of the TANGEDCO, Chennai, from 27.05.2013 to 03.06.2013 and the advertisement also further stated that the registered candidates only will be called for interview for the above said post. Admittedly, in the cases on hand, the petitioners have completed their one year apprenticeship training only after 03.06.2013 and therefore, they were unable to register their names and thus, they were not called for interview. In view of this, the petitioners have filed the present writ petitions with a prayer to consider them in any of the future vacancies.

16. Pending writ petitions, this Court, by order dated 25.10.2013, directed the respondents to call the petitioners for interview. Thereafter, the respondent Electricity Board issued



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

a notification dated 27.09.2013 inviting all the Graduate Engineers, who have completed one year apprenticeship at TANGEDCO/TANTRANSCO before the date of interview, to attend interview in their respective Regions, fixing the date of interview on 18.11.2013, 19.11.2013, 21.11.2013 and 22.11.2013. For better appreciation, relevant portion of the said notification is extracted hereunder:

“ Hence, it is notified that all graduate engineers who have completed one year apprenticeship at TANGEDCO / TANTRANSCO before the date of interview may attend interview in their respective regions/nearly centres on the above dates where they have completed the apprenticeship in the respective branch. They shall bring the training completion certificate issued by TANGEDCO / TANTRANSCO at the time of interview. In this regard, it is informed that their admission to the interview will be subject to the outcome of the W.P.No.26692 of 2013 pending before the High Court of Madras.”

17. Pursuant to the above said notification, the respondents have allowed all the petitioners to participate in the interview. After the selection process was over, the respondent Electricity Board have also selected 182 Assistant Engineers(Electrical), including the petitioners. Even though the petitioners are not eligible to be appointed as per the



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

previous notification dated 26.05.2013, fixing the cut-off date as 03.06.2013, by virtue of the subsequent notification issued on 27.09.2013 inviting all the Graduate Engineers, who have completed one year apprenticeship training before the date of interview i.e. on 18.11.2013, to participate in the interview, they became eligible as they have admittedly completed one year apprenticeship training before the above said interview dates.

18. Therefore, this Court directs the respondents to appoint the petitioners to the post of Assistant Engineer, if they have completed their apprenticeship training before their date of respective interview as per the subsequent notification dated 27.09.2013 and if they are otherwise eligible.”

2.11. Therefore, those selected candidates i.e. 182 including the writ petitioners were directed to be given appointment and accordingly appointment orders were given and they have been working.

2.12. Insofar as these appellants are concerned, their case is that, they become eligible as they completed the one year Apprenticeship Training well prior to the date of notification of the first notification i.e. 26.05.2013.



They also made an application and registered their name and attended the interview.

3. But before attending the interview, according to Mrs.AL.Gandhimathi, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellants, they noted that the second notification dated 27.09.2013 was issued where all those who completed the one year Apprenticeship Training before the interview date would become eligible to participate in the interview was mentioned and it was also mentioned that, their appointment to the interview will be subject to the outcome of the W.P.No.26692 of 2013 i.e. one of the three writ petitions herein.

4. Therefore it is the stand of the writ appellants that, because of that clause inserted in the second notification dated 27.09.2013 that, permitting those who have completed one year Apprenticeship Training before the date of interview, may attend interview, are eligible subject to the outcome of the writ petition, they claimed that they thought of that the issue would be squarely and comprehensively decided by the writ Court.



5. However, the Writ Court having taken note of the subsequent notification has come to a conclusion that, since 182 candidates out of 200 vacancies have been selected including majority of the writ petitioners they are eligible to get appointment orders, accordingly a direction was given to the TANGEDCO to post the writ petitioners as Assistant Engineers if they have completed their Apprenticeship Training before the date of respective interview as per the subsequent notification dated 27.09.2013.

6. In this regard, it is the grievance of the appellants that, had the second notification been not issued certainly the writ petitioners would not have come into the playing field and they would not have participated in the interview, since out of the 200 posts largely have been gained by them as they have been majority selected by the TANGEDCO the prospects of those appellants have become shattered as their performance even though comparatively higher or better than others they were not selected, the learned Senior Counsel contended.



7. In this context, the learned Senior Counsel would further add that, insofar as the cut-off mark for selection is concerned, nothing has been mentioned and what was the mark that has been fixed under various communal category for selection or zone of selection is concerned, that has also not been mentioned and what marks the selected candidates obtained also have not been disclosed and what for these appellants have not been selected also not been disclosed, therefore the appellants have been kept under dark all along.

8. However, without considering all these aspects since the learned Judge in the Writ Court allowed those writ petitions by giving a direction to TANGEDCO to appoint the selected Assistant Engineers including the writ petitioners, aggrieved over the same, as the third party appellants, after getting leave, they filed the present writ appeals, she contended.

9. She would also submit that, atleast two of the appellants herein had filed miscellaneous petition in M.P.No.4 of 2014 in W.P.No.30954 of 2013 to get impleaded and that was dismissed by the learned Judge at the time of passing orders in the writ petitions, in the impugned order dated 23.04.2014.



WEB COPY

10. The learned Senior Counsel would further contend that, once the first notification was issued where a cut-off date has been prescribed that cannot be changed or altered subsequently as it is a settled proposition of law that, once the game is started the rules regarding the game cannot be changed or altered in between the game. Based on the said proposition of law, the subsequent notification issued by the respondent TANGEDCO dated 27.09.2013 is completely vitiated and based on which the scope of eligibility for more people cannot be extended. Therefore by virtue of such extension of the scope of eligibility because of the 27.09.2013 notification already the eligible candidates like the appellants' prospects are affected and therefore the appellants are entitled to seek for interference of the order passed by the Writ Court which is impugned dated 23.04.2014, she contended.

11. However, Mr.K.Rajkumar, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the TANGEDCO would contend that, for totally 254 posts in various branches like Electrical, Mechanical and Civil, applications were invited, 4000+ applications were received. Based on the eligibility criteria all those



who become eligible were called for interview and the interview was conducted for 4 days between 18.11.2013 and 21.11.2013. He would also submit that, so far as the Assistant Engineer in Electrical post is concerned, the earmarked vacancies were 200 for which applications were called for, the appellants herein also come under the said category who claimed to have made an application and attended the interview. Therefore the interview was conducted for all those eligible candidates including the appellants and based on the performance they made in the interview an *inter se* mark having been calculated 182 people have become eligible as they come in the zone of consideration, they were selected out of the 200 vacancies, this was informed to the Writ Court at the time of final hearing itself.

12. By virtue of selection, that 182 persons who have been selected were given appointment and they have been working.

13. Insofar as the second notification or additional notification dated 27.09.2013 is concerned, it was not issued for extending the scope of



eligibility only for the writ petitioners but also all similarly placed persons like the writ petitioners who completed the one year Apprenticeship Training before the interview date and such kind of date can be fixed by the employer. As to which date can be taken into account for the purpose of fixing the eligibility criteria is concerned, law is well settled in this regard that, if a date is fixed by the employer, that date has to be taken into account and no date is fixed, the date of notification can be taken into account. Therefore, the learned Standing Counsel would submit that, in this case by virtue of the subsequent notification it has been extended and the interview date has been fixed as a date for taking into account of the completion of the eligibility criteria, that cannot be found fault with, based on which if the interview was conducted and as per the performance they made through the *inter se* merit was evaluated and accordingly the selection was made and appointment had been given, they have been working for the past 9 years in their respective capacity, therefore at this juncture the appellants cannot have any grievance unless and until they challenged the additional notification if at all they found any infirmity in the issuance of said additional notification dated 27.09.2013.



WEB COPY

14. We have given our anxious consideration to the aforesaid submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for both sides and have perused the materials placed before this Court.

15. Insofar as the writ petitioners who are the private respondents in these appeals are concerned, some of them have not been served and though some of them have been served, none of them appeared before this Court including the served respondents. However, in view of the order that we are going to pass in this common order, the non-serving of notice to some of the private respondents would not hamper the prospects of the disposal of these writ appeals.

16. Insofar as the grievance that has been espoused by the present appellants is concerned, admittedly they are the third parties to the writ proceedings, even though two of them had made an attempt to file a miscellaneous petition to get impleaded unsuccessfully. They were also eligible candidates and they made applications, their applications were



accepted and they were called for interview, they admittedly attended the interview and though it was claimed by them that, they performed well it is for the employer who conducted the interview has to evaluate their merits and if their merits are evaluated based on the *inter se* merit, their selection could have been made.

17. Insofar as their grievance is that, had the second notification was not issued, by virtue of that the writ petitioners, since had come within the zone of consideration for interview itself, would have been ousted and had they been ousted the people like the appellants would have been in a better or comfortable position to get through in the selection process.

18. If these are all the grounds mainly on which these appeals are filed, we are not inclined to accept those grounds because those grounds are based on surmises only. The reason being that, when the second notification dated 27.09.2013 was issued, it is submitted by the learned Senior Counsel for the appellants that, the appellants also knew that the scope of eligibility has been further extended upto the date of interview. In other words, those



who completed the one year Apprenticeship Training before the interview date can also become eligible to participate in the interview, by virtue of that some more candidates also may come into the zone.

19. When that being so, by virtue of some more candidates are allowed because of the additional notification, the appellants or like persons could have very well challenged that notification stating all these grounds that once the notification was issued and the date was fixed as a criteria that cannot be changed or extended during the process of selection, therefore on that ground the second notification was bad in law and based on which they could have agitated the issue by challenging the second notification, but admittedly they have not challenged the same and admittedly they failed to challenge the same.

20. Moreover, insofar as the fixing a cut-off date for interview is concerned, law is well settled that, if the notification prescribes the cut-off date that will be the cut-off date, however the notification does not prescribe the cut-off date, that date of notification is construed as the cut-off date.



Here though initially the notification was issued on 26.05.2013 fixing the cut-off date on 03.06.2013, subsequently the date has been extended by subsequent notification dated 27.09.2013 upto the date of interview which starts on 18.11.2013 and ends at 21.11.2013. Therefore the date from 03.06.013 to 18.11.2013 extended by virtue of the second notification has never been questioned before the Court of Law by anyone including the appellants.

21. Therefore, as per the second notification the extended cut-off date has been acted upon, people were called for interview, accepting the same the appellants also participated in the interview, permitted the TANGEDCO to go ahead with the interview and the interview was completed and marks awarded to them having been evaluated *inter se* merit has been fixed and the ranking also has been made.

22. Based on the ranking they selected 182 candidates out of 200 vacancies. Therefore the fact remains that, still 18 vacancies were there, meaning thereby for filling up those 18 vacancies there had been no eligible



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

candidates who come to the zone of consideration by crossing the cut-off mark fixed in this regard by the TANGEDCO.

23. Therefore the reason on surmises made on behalf of the appellants that, they performed well in the interview despite that they have not been selected and no cut-off mark has been given and what marks they obtained have not been given and based on which if the writ petitioners had been ousted from the purview of selection process they would have been coming and been in a comfortable position in the selection list are concerned, these are all the arguments which have been made on behalf of the appellants merely based on surmises and therefore absolutely there has been no proof to establish the same.

24. Even still 18 vacancies were there for which there was no eligible candidate to be selected, if that being so, the claim made by the appellants that they performed well comparing with other candidates, certainly if they have not come to be selected as top candidates, the appellants could have come after the 182 candidates as the appellants are only two in numbers,



therefore these two people have got the enough space to compete and get succeeded and despite that they could not get selected thereby meaning is they have not performed well in the interview.

25. Insofar as the method is concerned, it is only an interview, therefore we cannot evaluate on what basis marks were awarded, because, a criteria has been followed by them and since method of awarding mark through interview has not been questioned by the appellants or any candidate during the process of selection and therefore at this juncture the method adopted by the TANGEDCO also cannot be questioned.

26. Insofar as the direction issued by the learned Judge at para 18 of the impugned order is concerned, after having noted the facts that the second notification was issued, by virtue of that the participation of the writ petitioners in the interview based on which *inter se* merit has been fixed and the 182 candidates including the majority of the writ petitioners having been selected, a selection list was also made ready. All these positions were brought to the notice of the learned Judge who having taken note of the



factual matrix had given a direction to appoint the selected candidates including the writ petitioners, therefore we do not find any error with the learned Judge who was pleased to give such a direction in para 18 of the order.

27. The fault on the part of the appellants is that, if at all they had a grievance against the TANGEDCO in issuing the second notification extending the cut-off date in the scope of the eligibility to more candidates that could have been challenged in time but 10 years have gone after the notification was issued on 27.09.2013, at this juncture if at all the appellants come forward to challenge the same on merit whether that would be successful or not cannot be decided at this stage, however the learned Senior Counsel for the appellants made a request before this Court that, the appellants can be given a liberty to challenge the selection already made based on the second notification dated 27.09.2013.

28. For the said plea we are inclined to say that liberty is always there to any litigant like the appellants to challenge the same provided if the



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

appellants is able to give a satisfactory reason to overcome the *doctrine of latches*.

29. In this context, we are inclined to observe that because of the pendency of these writ appeals from 2014 such a plea if at all come from the appellants to condone the latches, that can very well be considered by the Court in an appropriate proceedings if the appellants are willing to initiate the same.

30. With the said observation, we feel that the Writ Appeals since fail for the aforestated discussions, they are liable to be dismissed, accordingly are dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

[R.S.K., J.] [K.B., J.]
10.07.2023

Index : Yes

Speaking Order : Yes

Neutral Citation : Yes

Sgl

28/30



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

To

WEB COPY

1. The Chairman,
The Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
Anna Salai, Chennai – 2.
2. The Chairman/Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution
Corporation, Head Quarters Complex,
144 Anna Salai, Chennai – 2.
3. The Chief Engineer/Personnel,
Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution
Corporation Limited,
144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.



WEB COPY



W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

R. SURESH KUMAR, J.
And
K.KUMARESH BABU, J.

Sgl

W.A.Nos.692 to 694 of 2014

10.07.2023