



W.P.(MD)No.3921 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED:01.03.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.(MD)No.3921 of 2023

W.M.P(MD).Nos.3750 and 3752 of 2023

M.Mugila

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District.

2.The Tahsildar,
Thiruvadanai Taluk,
Pudukkottai District.

3.Gayathiri

... Respondents

Prayer:- Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records pertaining to the order passed by the second respondent in proceedings in Na.Ka.No.A1/4862/2022 dated 14.01.2023, quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to appoint the petitioner as Village Assistant, Mavoor Revenue Village, Thiruvadanai Taluk,



W.P.(MD)No.3921 of 2023

Ramanathapuram District, with all consequential benefits.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Panneer Selvam
For R1 and R2 : Ms.K.Christy Theboral
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed to call for the records pertaining to the order passed by the second respondent in proceedings in Na.Ka.No.A1/4862/2022 dated 14.01.2023, quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to appoint the petitioner as Village Assistant at Mavoor Revenue Village, Thiruvadanai Taluk, Ramanathapuram District, with all consequential benefits.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the respondents issued a Notification to fill up the posts of Village Assistant and totally, nine posts were notified to the second respondent Taluk. She applied for the said post in Mavoor Revenue Village, Thiruvadanai Taluk, Ramanathapuram under BC non-priority category and she has submitted her application on



W.P.(MD)No.3921 of 2023

WEB COPY

06.11.2022. The written examination was conducted on 04.12.2022 and she was called for interview on 04.01.2023. She has also attended the interview. When she was waiting for appointment order, she was informed that the third respondent was appointed as Village Assistant. Hence, the present Writ Petition has been filed.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the Selection Committee has not published the marks of the candidates before issuing the appointment order and the selection process was conducted without disclosing the particulars of the candidates. Hence, the impugned order issued by the second respondent is liable to be set aside.

4. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents would submit that the petitioner has secured 63 marks in the written and other eligibility test and 6 marks in interview, whereas, the third respondent has secured 71 marks in the written and other eligibility test and 12 marks in interview, which is the higher mark. Hence, the third



W.P.(MD)No.3921 of 2023

respondent was selected as Village Assistant. The interview was conducted by the Tahsildar, Special Tahsildar and the Deputy Tahsildar as per the guidelines issued in the Government Order and hence, there is no illegality or irregularity in the appointment of the third respondent.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents.

6. The facts in the present case are not in dispute. Admittedly, the petitioner and the third respondent have applied for the post of Village Assistant at Mavoor Revenue Village, Thiruvadanai Taluk, Ramanathapuram. It is seen from the records that the petitioner has secured 63 marks in written and other eligibility test and 6 marks in interview, whereas, the third respondent has secured 71 marks in written and other eligibility test and 12 marks in interview. After considering the eligibility, the marks secured by the candidates and the performance during the interview, the Selection Committee has appointed the third respondent as Village Assistant at Mavoor Revenue Village,



W.P.(MD)No.3921 of 2023

WEB COPY

Thiruvadanai Taluk, Ramanathapuram. The selection process was conducted as per G.O.Ms.No.574, Revenue and Disaster Management, Department, dated 17.10.2020 and G.O.Ms.No.521, Revenue Department, dated 17.06.1998. Hence, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order issued by the second respondent.

7. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

01.03.2023

ssb

To

1.The District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District.

2.The Tahsildar,
Thiruvadanai Taluk,
Pudukkottai District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.3921 of 2023

M.DHANDAPANI,J.

ssb

W.P.(MD)No.3921 of 2023

01.03.2023