



WEB COPY



WP.No.6767/2017

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 21.07.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN

WP.No.6767/2017

K.Thirunavukkarasu

... Petitioner

Versus

1.The Chairman

**Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
800, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 002.**

2.The Chief Engineer [Personnel]

**Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
800, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 002.**

3.The Superintending Engineer

CEDC/Metro, Coimbatore-12.

4.The Executive Engineer/O&M

**CEDC/Metro Ondipudur Division
21C, Vasantha Nagar,
Singanallur-5.**

... Respondents

Prayer :- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the 2nd respondent to consider representation dated 11.07.2016 and 27.01.2017 of the petitioner, conduct enquiry and pass orders in accordance with law within the time



WP.No.6767/2017

frame fixed by this Court.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Arumugavel
For Respondent : Mr.K.Rajkumar
Standing counsel

ORDER

- (1) The writ petition has been filed in the nature of a mandamus, seeking a direction against the 2nd respondent, Chief Engineer [Personnel], Tamil Nadu Electricity Board at Chennai, to consider the representations given by the petitioner on 11.07.2016 and on 27.01.2017.
- (2) The petitioner had joined as Helper Trainee in the respondents in the year 2001. His services were regularised. He was appointed as Helper in the year 2003. He was then appointed as Commercial Assistant in the year 2004 and promoted as Commercial Inspector in the year 2008. He also completed Diploma in Electrical and Electronic Engineering in 2012. This has also been registered in the Service Register. The respondents had sought a suitability Report for promotion to the post of Junior Engineer Grade-II from among the



WP.No.6767/2017

WEB COPY

Commercial Inspectors/Line Inspectors who had possessed the aforementioned Diploma or equivalent qualification. But the petitioner had also proposed his name for such promotion. Complaining that the representation given by the petitioner had not been answered by the respondents, the petitioner had filed the present writ petition.

- (3) Learned counsel for the petitioner states that subsequently, the petitioner had actually been promoted as Junior Engineer. Learned counsel then placed a request that the seniority of the petitioner may now be examined by the respondents.
- (4) That is an issue which the petitioner will have to seek by way of separate proceedings if the seniority is actually adverse to him. There are no such indications that the petitioner's seniority has been placed to his disadvantage. If it is placed to his disadvantage, the petitioner may give necessary representation. I am confident that it would be addressed in manner known to law and in accordance with Rules and Regulations. So far as the issue raised regarding the promotion as Junior Engineer is concerned, the issue does not arise for adjudication



WP.No.6767/2017

any more since the petitioner had already been promoted as Junior
Engineer.

(5) The writ petition therefore, stands **dismissed**. No costs.

21.07.2023

AP

Internet : Yes

To

- 1.The Chairman
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
800, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 002.
- 2.The Chief Engineer [Personnel]
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board
800, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 002.
- 3.The Superintending Engineer
CEDC/Metro, Coimbatore-12.
- 4.The Executive Engineer/O&M
CEDC/Metro Ondipudur Division
21C, Vasantha Nagar,
Singanallur-5.

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.,

AP



WEB COPY



WP.No.6767/2017

WP.No.6767/2013

21.07.2023