



W.P(MD)No.7351 of 2023

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 27.06.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

W.P(MD)No.7351 of 2023
and
W.M.P(MD)No.6900 of 2023

S.Barathiraja

... Petitioner

Vs

1.The Director General of Police (Law and Order),
O/o. Director General of Police,
Beach Road,
Chennai – 600 004.

2.The Superintendent of Police,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records entire relevant records of the impugned order passed by the second respondent, vide C.A.No.A3/3077/65/2020-3, dated 02.02.2022, and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the respondents to fix the petitioner's seniority in recruiting batch in the year of 2012 in a appropriate place based on the petitioner's representation on 26.09.2020, within a stipulated time that may be fixed by this Court.



W.P(MD)No.7351 of 2023

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Velmurugan

For Respondents : Mr.K.Balasubramani
Special Government Pleader

ORDER

Heard the learned counsel on either side.

2. The petitioner took part in the recruitment process for the post of Grade II Police Constable in the year 2012. He was however disqualified. The petitioner submitted his representation and it was favourably considered and he was sponsored for training in the year 2015. The petitioner is working since 19.09.2015. The request of the petitioner is that his seniority must be reckoned on par with 2012 batchmates. His request was negatived. Challenging the same, the present writ petition has been filed.

3. After hearing the learned counsel on either side, I am more than satisfied that the issue raised in this writ petition is no longer *res integra*. Vide order dated 06.06.2023 made in W.P(MD)No.5356 of 2023 (M.Mohan Vs Director General of Police (law & Order) & Others) had held as follows:

“5. I carefully considered the rival contention and went through the materials on record. The issue raised in the writ



petition is no longer res integra. An identical issue arose for consideration in W.P.No.22454 of 2021 vide order dated 27.10.2021. The writ petition was allowed in the following terms:-

“7. This is the case where the petitioner has successfully cleared examinations and the mile stone prescribed for qualifying himself to the post of Grade II Police Constable in the recruitment since during 2001-2003. However, the petitioner was not selected on the ground that the petitioner was medically unfit on account of bilateral flat feet which has been considered and not to be a qualifying for appointing the petitioner as Grade II Police Constable. The delay in getting appointed with the respondents was not on account of the fault of the petitioner but on account of the stand taken by the respondents. As a matter of fact under similar circumstances in W.P.(MD)No.33479 of 2016 by an order dated 02.09.2021, the appointment was directed to be given pursuant to the order of this Court in W.P.No.3273 of 2016, dated 25.01.2008. The issue is no longer res-integra and the issue is squarely covered in favour of the petitioner. There the petitioner had sought for refixing of seniority to include his name in the appropriate list and selection list during the year 2001-2003 for the post of Police Constable with effect from the date of training.

8. In view of the above, the writ petition stands allowed with consequential relief to the petitioner. The respondents are therefore directed to carry out the necessary corrections in the Service Register of the petitioner by refixing the seniority of the petitioner along with the batchmates who participated in the Recruitment called for during the year 2001-2003. The above exercise shall be carried out by the respondent within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”



WEB COPY

6. *I am inclined to adopt the very same approach. As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, the petitioner was not at all at fault. Only because the recruiting agency proceeded on misconception that the petitioner's vision was defective, he was not appointed. If everything had taken place in the appropriate time sequence, the petitioner would have been sent for training in the year 2012 itself. Therefore, for the fault committed by the respondents, the petitioner cannot be made to suffer. Lost of three years seniority will definitely have serious civil consequence. The question that arises for consideration is whether the petitioner's application should be rejected as barred by limitation. Section 40(6) of the Tamil Nadu Government Servant (Condition of Service) Act, 2016 is as follows:-*

“Application for the revision of seniority of a person in a service, class, category or grade shall be submitted to the appointing authority within a period of three years from the date of appointment to such service, class, category or grade or within a period of three years from the date of order fixing the seniority, as the case may be. Any application received after the said period of three years shall be summarily rejected. This shall not however be applicable to cases of rectifying orders, resulting from mistake of facts.”

The provision itself makes it clear that limitation will not be applicable to cases of rectifying orders resulting from mistake of facts. The case on hand would fall under such category. Non-inclusion of the petitioner in the seniority list of the year 2012 is a mistake of fact.



W.P(MD)No.7351 of 2023

7. In this view of the matter, the orders impugned in the writ petition are set aside. The respondents are directed to fix the petitioner's seniority in the recruitment batch of the year 2012 at the appropriate place.”

The same approach has to be adopted to the present case also. The order impugned in this writ petition is set aside. The respondents are directed to fix the petitioner's seniority in the recruitment batch 2012 in appropriate place.

4. This writ petition is allowed accordingly. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

27.06.2023

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
NCC : Yes / No
MGA

To

1.The Director General of Police (Law and Order),
O/o. Director General of Police,
Beach Road,
Chennai – 600 004.

2.The Superintendent of Police,
Ramanathapuram District,
Ramanathapuram.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.7351 of 2023

G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.

MGA

W.P(MD)No.7351 of 2023
and
W.M.P(MD)No.6900 of 2023

27.06.2023