



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

ORDER RESERVED ON : 01.11.2023

ORDER PRONOUNCED ON : 07.11.2023

**CORAM:
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR**

**W.P.(MD).No.20670 of 2021
and WMP(MD).Nos.17291, 17292 and 17294 of 2021
and WMP(MD).No.21674 of 2022
and WMP(MD).No.22491 of 2023**

C.Sakthimurugan
Executive Engineer (RD)
District Rural Development Agency
Virudhunagar
Virudhunagar District

....Petitioner

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Principal Secretary to Government
Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department
Chennai

2.The Director of Rural Development and Panchayat Raj
Office of the Director of Rural Development and Panchayat Raj
Chennai 600 015

3.The Secretary
Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission
VOC Nagar
Park Town
Chennai 600 003



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

4.V.Venkatesan
Executive Engineer
Office of the National Health Mission
Teynampet
Chennai 600 006

...Respondents

(R4 is impleaded vide
Court order dated 01.11.2023)

Prayer: This Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to the impugned order passed by the second respondent vide his proceedings in Proc.No. 56857/2021/EE1.2 dated 20.10.2021 and quash the same as illegal.

For Petitioner	: Mr.M.Ajmalkhan Senior counsel For M/s.Ajmal Associates
For R1 & R2	: Mr.V.Arun Additional Advocate General Assisted by Mr.K.S.Selvaganesan Additional Government Pleader
For R3	: Mr.J.Anandkumar
For R4	:M/s.Dakshayini Reddy Senior Counsel For Mr.R.L.Dhilipan Pandian

ORDER

The present writ petition has been filed by an Executive Engineer of Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department challenging the



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

proceedings of the second respondent herein dated 20.10.2021 wherein the seniority list of Assistant Engineer (Civil) in the year 1997 was revised on the basis of merit rank published by Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission.

2.The contentions of the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the writ petitioner are as follows:

(i)The petitioner had applied for the post of Assistant Engineer pursuant to the notification issued by the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission and he was appointed as an Assistant Engineer on 18.12.1998. A seniority list was published by the second respondent Department with the concurrence of TNPSC in the year 1998.

(ii)Based upon the above said seniority, the petitioner was promoted as Assistant Executive Engineer on 02.03.2006 and later, he was promoted as Executive Engineer on 17.09.2009.

(iii)Under the impugned order dated 20.10.2021, the second respondent had published a revised the seniority list of all the Assistant Engineers recruited in the year 1997-1998 on the basis of merit.

(iv)The seniority fixed in the year 1998 had been in operation for more than two decades and suddenly, through the impugned order, it is sought to be revised without putting on notice the affected persons.

(v)As could be seen from the impugned order, revision of seniority has been carried out in compliance with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

dated 01.10.2021. The petitioner is not aware of the said order, in view of the fact that he was not made as a party to the same.

(vi) Even prior to the issuance of the impugned order, no notice was issued nor any opportunity was given before revising the seniority list. The seniority being a civil right, the petitioner ought not to have been deprived of the same without issuing any prior notice.

(vii) As could be seen from the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP(C) No.22094-22098 of 2015, dated 22.01.2016, the seniority list published by the Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department was not the subject matter and therefore, any order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court would affect only the parties to the said judgment and the Department that was a party to the said judgment.

(viii) The impugned order reveals seniority was fixed in the year 1998 and on the basis of the said seniority, the petitioner has already achieved two promotions. Any attempt made on the part of the respondent authority to unsettle the said seniority would only result in revision of the petitioner to a lower cadre. Therefore, it is arbitrary.

(ix) As per Rule 35(f) of Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules, any request for rectification of seniority should be made within a period of three years and therefore, the respondent authorities are not entitled to revise the seniority after 23 years.



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

(x) Though the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **(2003) 5 SCC 604 (Bimlesh Tanwar Vs.State of Haryana and others)** has to be followed, the application of the said judgement depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case and it is always subject to the delay and laches on the part of the persons claiming revision of seniority.

(xi) One of the Assistant Engineers of the Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department had filed W.P.No.1447 of 2005 seeking to quash the seniority list based on the roster point and refix his seniority. The said writ petition was dismissed by the learned Single Judge on 18.10.2012. No appeal was filed challenging the said order and hence, it has become final.

(xii) The Hon'ble Division Bench judgment reported in **(2015) 4 MLJ 281 (N.Santhosh Kumar and others Vs. The Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission and others)** had dealt with the seniority of the Assistant Engineer from the Public Works Department and the Highways Department alone.

(xiii) The order of the Division Bench cited above was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **SLP (Civil) Nos.14794 of 2015 and 23070 and 23071 of 2015**. The Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to dismiss the said Special Leave Petitions. Therefore, even before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department was not a party.



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

(xiv)Alleging violation of the order of Hon'ble Supreme Court, Contempt Petition (Civil) No.638 of 2017 was filed, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to direct the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission to strictly follow the merit basis seniority and directed the T.N.P.S.C to comply with the said order. In order to escape from the contempt proceedings, the present impugned order was passed by the authorities on 20.10.2021 without issuing notice to the aggrieved party.

(xv)When the further proceedings in the contempt petition was taken up, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to pass an order on 18.04.2023 fixing a cut-off to the effect that the seniority list that was prepared before 10.03.2003 shall not be disturbed whether it is based upon the roster point or on merit. In the present case, the seniority of the petitioner and others got crystallised by publication of the seniority list in the year 1998 itself and therefore, the subsequent order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 18.04.2023 which is in favour of the writ petitioner should be taken into consideration.

(xvi)The order impugned in the writ petition has been passed relying upon the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 01.10.2021 and the same has been modified by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by its order dated 18.04.2023. Therefore, the respondent authorities ought to have followed the modified order of the Hon'ble Supreme court dated 18.04.2023 and ought to



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

have recalled their impugned order dated 20.10.2021.

WEB COPY

(xvii) Even assuming that the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **(2003) 5 SCC 604 (Bimlesh Tanwar Vs.State of Haryana and others)** is applicable to the Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department, in view of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 18.04.2023, the seniority having got crystallised prior to 10.03.2003 ought not to have been disturbed by the authorities by issuing the impugned order. The impugned order having been issued relying upon the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 01.10.2021 ought to have been cancelled by the authorities, in view of the subsequent order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 18.04.2003.

(xviii) The Hon'ble Division Bench of our High Court in a judgment reported in **(2019) 6 CTC 750 (K.Raja and others Vs. Additional Chief Secretary to Government and others)** while declaring Sections 1(2), 40 and 70 of the Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016 as ultra virus vires and unconstitutional has proceeded to hold delay, laches, acquiescence and accrued right are the factors to be considered by the Court when similar reliefs are sought for in future. The said Division Bench judgment has been confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In the present case, after a delay of more than 20 years, settled seniority is sought to be unsettled. Therefore, the order impugned in the writ petition is liable to be set



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

aside and the seniority of the writ petitioner should be restored as it was published in the year 1998.

3.The contentions of the learned Additional Advocate General are as follows:

(i)The petitioner was appointed to the post of Assistant Engineer in the year 1998 and the seniority was fixed on the basis of communal roster. The Hon'ble Division Bench in a judgment reported in ***(2015) 4 MLJ 281 (N.Santhosh Kumar and others Vs. The Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission and others)*** had arrived at a categorical finding that the reservation is limited only to the extent of induction of the candidate, but the seniority has to be fixed only on the basis of the merit list prepared by the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission. This order was confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by its order dated 22.01.2016. Alleging violation of the order, contempt petition was filed in Contempt Petition(Civil).No.638 of 2017 in which, the Hon'ble Supreme Court strictly directed the authorities to refix the seniority on the basis of merit list prepared by the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission.

(ii)In compliance with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, T.N.P.S.C had revised the seniority and published the seniority list on 12.10.2021. As a consequential order, the second respondent department



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

published the revised seniority list on 20.10.2021 which is impugned in the writ petition.

(iii) According to the learned Additional Advocate General, the present writ petition is filed challenging only a consequential order dated 20.10.2021 without challenging the publication of the revised seniority list by the T.N.P.S.C on 12.10.2021 and therefore, the writ petition is not maintainable.

(iv) One P. Madhu who is an Engineer from the Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department and also an beneficiary of the order of Hon'ble Supreme Court had initiated contempt petition as against the department for non-compliance of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Hon'ble Supreme Court by its order dated 18.04.2023 had directed all the 54 departments of the State of Tamil Nadu to comply with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. That apart, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had fixed a cut-off date to the effect that the seniority list which have been finalised prior to 10.03.2003 (date of judgment in *Bimlesh Tanwar's* case) shall not be disturbed and the seniority list that was prepared after the said cut-off date shall be revised only on the basis of the merit list prepared by TNPSC.

(v) The learned Additional Advocate General had further contended that pursuant to the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, if any, seniority list has already been revised for selection of the period prior to 2003, the benefit granted to such persons as per their seniority or as per their merit shall not be



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

disturbed. In the present case, the seniority list was revised as per order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, dated 01.10.2021 and therefore, the said revised seniority list on the basis of merit is protected in Paragraph No.22 of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 18.04.2023. Therefore, the contention of the learned counsel for the writ petitioner that if any revision of the seniority has taken place pursuant to the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, dated 01.10.2021, it should be revised for the second time based upon the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, dated 18.04.2023 is not legally sustainable. He had further contended that for reporting compliance, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has posted the matter in the first week of January-2024.

(vi)The learned Additional Advocate General had further contended that one V.Venkatesan and two others had filed WP.Nos.1477, 3117 and 7081 of 2021 before the Principal Bench forbearing authorities from making any promotion to the post of Chief Engineer till the seniority list of Assistant Engineers is revised as per order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In one of the writ petitions, the Government Order promoting a candidate as Chief Engineer was also under challenge. The learned Single Judge was pleased to allow the writ petition on 21.12.2022 quashing the proceedings and granting four months time to the private respondent who were juniors to the writ petitioners therein. Alleging violation of the said orders, Contempt Petition



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

No. 1555 of 2023 was filed and it has been adjourned to 15.11.2023.

WEB COPY

(vii) He had further pointed out that in view of the interim order passed by this Court, the Department is not in a position to comply with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the order of the learned Single Judge of the Principal Bench and they are facing contempt proceedings.

(viii) The learned Additional Advocate General had further contended that the impugned revised seniority list has been published only in compliance with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Therefore, the question of issuing any prior notice to the writ petition would not arise. Hence, he prayed for dismissing the writ petition.

4.Contentions of the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the impleaded fourth respondent are as follows:

(i) The contention of the writ petitioner that belatedly the seniority list is sought to be revised is not factually correct. One V.Venkatesan had filed W.P.No.29380 of 2005 before the Principal Bench of Madras High Court seeking to quash the seniority list dated 25.10.2004 and for a direction to revise the seniority list on the basis of merit determined by marks obtained by the respective candidates. When the said writ petition was pending, the respondent authorities have already revised the seniority list in compliance with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 01.10.2021 by way of impugned proceedings dated 20.10.2021. Recording the same, the said writ



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

petition was disposed of on 0202.2022.

WEB COPY

(ii)The learned Senior Counsel further contended that by an order dated 01.10.2021, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had directed the authorities to strictly comply with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 22.01.2016 with a warning to the contemnor to be careful in future.

(iii)The Principal Secretary to Government, Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department filed a compliance affidavit before the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 15.12.2021 indicating the fact that by way of revised seniority list dated 20.10.2021, they have complied with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to record the said affidavit of compliance and closed the contempt proceedings on 19.01.2022. Therefore, any attempt made on the part of the writ petitioner would clearly in violation of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

(iv)The learned Senior Counsel had further contended that the compliance affidavit filed by the Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department was placed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in which the order impugned in the writ petition has been specifically mentioned. In approving the present impugned order, the contempt proceedings have been closed. Therefore, this Court cannot take a different view from that of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

(v)The learned Senior Counsel had further contended that the order of this Court in W.P.Nos.1477, 3117 and 7081 of 2021 dated 21.12.2022 has become final. Five of the batch-mates of the present writ petitioners have been impleaded and they have also not chosen to challenge the same despite being represented through their Counsel.

(vi)The learned Senior Counsel had further pointed out that those private respondents have conceded to the fact that they are juniors to the writ petitioners therein and just requested four months time to hold on to their respective position. Therefore, the present writ petition filed through another employee of the same batch taking a different stand would not be maintainable and it would be clearly in violation of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Hence, she prayed for dismissal of the writ petition.

5.I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made on either side and perused the material records.

6.The writ petitioner was appointed as an Assistant Engineer in Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department in the year 1998. It is an admitted fact that a seniority list of the Assistant Engineer was published in the year 1998 on the basis of roster point by the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission and the said seniority was prevailing till passing of the order impugned in the writ petition on 20.10.2021.



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

7.The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a judgment reported in **(2003) 5 SCC**

604 (Bimlesh Tanwar Vs.State of Haryana and others) dated 10.03.2003 in

Paragraph No.40 has held as follows:

“40.An affirmative action in terms of Article 16(4) of the Constitution is meant for providing a representation of class of citizenry who are socially or economically backward. Article 16 of the Constitution of India is applicable in the case of an appointment. It does not speak of fixation of seniority. Seniority is, thus, not to be fixed in terms of the roster points. If that is done, the rule of affirmative action would be extended which would strictly not be in consonance of the constitutional schemes. We are of the opinion that the decision in P.S. Ghalaut does not lay down a good law.”

8.In the above said judgment, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has made it clear that the seniority list of a selected candidate would only be on the basis of merit rank published by the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission and not on the basis of roster point. Relying upon the said judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, a batch of writ petitions came to be filed by the Assistant Engineer of Highways Department and Public Works Department seeking to revise their seniority list on the basis of their marks obtained in the T.N.P.S.C selection. A learned Single Judge was pleased to dismiss the same on 18.10.2012. However, on appeal, the Division Bench of this Court in a judgment reported in **(2015) 4 MLJ 281 (N.Santhosh Kumar and others Vs.**



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

The Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission and others) was pleased to allow the writ appeals with a direction to the official respondents to take the rank assigned by the Service Commission to the selectees, as the basis for fixation of seniority. This order was confirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by its order dated 22.01.2016 in SLP(Civil) Nos.23070 to 23071 of 2015. Alleging violation of the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, Contempt Petition (Civil).No.638 of 2017 was filed by one V.Senthur and another in which a detailed order was passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 01.10.2021 warning the official respondents to comply with the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 22.01.2016.

9.The Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission has revised the seniority list of the Assistant Engineers of the Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department and published a seniority list on 12.10.2021 on the basis of merit rank secured by the candidates. A consequential order was passed by the Department on 20.10.2021 implementing the order of the T.N.P.S.C and in consonance with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. This consequential order of the second department has been challenged in the present writ petition mainly relying upon the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 18.04.2023 in the subsequent contempt proceedings.

10.According to the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the writ petitioner, the revised seniority list which is impugned in the writ petition has




W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

been issued in compliance of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 01.10.2021 whereas the said order has been modified by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by its order dated 18.04.2023. In the order dated 18.04.2023, for the first time, a cut-off date was fixed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court to the effect that the seniority list that were finalised prior to 10.03.2003 shall not be disturbed and all other seniority list which were finalised after 10.03.2003 shall be revised on the basis of the merit as determined by T.N.P.S.C.

11.It is further contended that in Paragraph No.22 of the said order, it has been clarified that in case of selection held prior to 2003, if seniority list has been published giving benefit to the persons selected as per their seniority or as per merit, the same shall not to be disturbed. Therefore, according to the learned counsel for the writ petitioner, the seniority list having been prepared in the year 1998 on the basis of roster point, it shall not to be disturbed even as per the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. According to him, in the present case, the respondent authorities are not considering the subsequent order of the Hon'ble Supreme court dated 18.04.2023 and they are still relying upon the order passed in contempt proceedings dated 01.10.2021. In view of modified order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the revised seniority list impugned in the writ petition should be set aside.

12.For the purpose of clarity, the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in

Contempt Petition (Civil) Diary No.6415 of 2021 dated 18.04.2023



“16. We are of the view that though it can be said that even after the judgment of the Indira Sawhney(supra) on 16th November, 1992, the State could not have prepared the merit list on the basis of roster point, we find that it will not be appropriate to reopen the issues from as early as 1992. We find that in any case, once the law was pronounced by this Court specifically in the case of Bimlesh Tanwar(supra), the State was bound to follow the same.

17. We, therefore, though are not inclined to disturb the seniority lists which are finalized prior to 10th March, 2003, wherein the benefit is granted to either of the parties i.e. as per the roster or as per (seniority list) the seniority list finalized after 10th March, 2003 will have to be re-visited in accordance with the law laid down by this Court in Bimlesh Tanwar (supra) and the first judgment of the Madras High Court.

18. We are unable to accept the contention of the learned AAG that the State is not equipped to complete the exercise. He submitted that this exercise has to be conducted in about 54 Departments.

19.If the State has 54 Departments, at least there would be 54 Secretaries/Principal Secretaries/Additional Chief Secretaries heading those Departments. Under such Secretaries, there will be at least half a dozen Joint Secretaries and more than a dozen Deputy Secretaries and about two dozen under Secretaries working in each of the Department. Further, at the divisional levels also, there would be Heads who would be heading the



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

Department insofar as the Divisions are concerned. We are therefore, not inclined to accept the argument.

20.If the State has the will to do, it can very well comply with the orders passed by the Division Bench of the Madras High Court and affirmed by this Court.

21.We therefore, direct the State Government to complete the exercise of finalizing the seniority lists of “selection processes” conducted after 10th March, 2003, on the basis of the principle that the seniority list shall be reckoned only on the basis of the merit as determined by the TNPSC in the selection process.

22.It is further made clear that if any list is finalized in case of selection held prior to 2003 giving benefit to the persons selected as per their seniority or as per merit, the same shall also not to be disturbed.”

13.As rightly contended by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the fourth respondent, the Principal Secretary to the Rural Development Department had filed a compliance affidavit before the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 15.12.2021 in which, paragraph Nos.7 to 9 of the said affidavit are extracted as follows:

“7.I humbly submit that having received the above said revised seniority list drawn on the basis of merit on 12.10.2021, as explained supra, the Director of Rural Development and Panchayat Raj had communicated and circulated the above said revised seniority list, drawn on the basis of merit to the



batchmates concerned vide the Director of Rural Development and Panchayat Raj proceedings No.56857/2024/EE 1.2, dated 20.10.2021 (Annexure-III)

8.I humbly submit that in order to put into effect the revised seniority list (based on merit) in its letter and spirit, the revision of seniority for the category of Assistant Engineers has been effected.

9.I humbly submit that, the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, dated 01.10.2021 has been fully complied with in its true letter and spirit, by revising the seniority of all selectees covered in the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission's Notification dated 26.09.1997 (Annexure-I) for Recruitment (Direct) for the post Assistant Engineer (Rural Development) in Panchayat Unions for the year 1997, on merit basis."

14.Recording the averments in the compliance affidavit, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to close the contempt proceedings.

15.In view of the above said facts, it is clear that the revised seniority list published by T.N.P.S.C on 12.10.2021 with regard to the Assistant Engineer of Rural Development Department and the consequential order passed by the concerned Department (impugned order) on 20.10.2021 have been placed on record before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and on the basis of the said compliance affidavit, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to close the contempt proceedings. Therefore, the petitioner cannot be heard to



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

contend that the revised seniority list published by the second respondent Department under the impugned order dated 20.10.2021 is not in consonance with the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

16.The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the writ petitioner made an emphasis over the clarification issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Paragraph No.22 of the order dated 18.04.2023. According to him, the seniority list for the selection held prior to 10.03.2003, giving benefit to the persons selected as per their seniority or as per their merit shall not be disturbed.

17.The Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to fix the cut-off date as 10.03.2003 based upon the date of judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Bimlesh Tanwar's* case. As per Paragraph No.21 of the said judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 18.04.2023, all the seniority lists that were finalized after 10.03.2003 have to be revisited and a revised seniority list has to be prepared on the basis of the merit list prepared by T.N.P.S.C. This cut-off date was introduced by the Hon'ble Supreme Court for the first time in their order dated 18.04.2023. Therefore, in Paragraph No.22, the Hon'ble Supreme Court was pleased to clarify that in case if any seniority list for the selections prior to 10.03.2003 has already been revised (from roster to merit based) on the basis of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Bimlesh Tanwar's* case, the same shall not be disturbed. In other words, any revision of seniority



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

for the selections prior to 10.03.2003 which have been effected before 18.04.2023 from roster to merit shall not be revised for the second time in view of the introduction of cut-off date in the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, dated 18.04.2023.

18.In the present case, the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 10.01.2021 has already been complied with by the second respondent Department by way of filing compliance affidavit on 15.12.2021 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Therefore, seniority list has already been revised (from roster to merit based) prior to 18.04.2023 itself. Hence, the contention of the writ petitioner that his communal roster seniority should be restored is not legally sustainable.

19.In view of the above said deliberations, there are no merits in the writ petition. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

07.11.2023

Internet : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No
msa



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government
State of Tamil Nadu
Rural Development and Panchayat Raj Department
Chennai

- 2.The Director of Rural Development and Panchayat Raj
Office of the Director of Rural Development and Panchayat Raj
Chennai 600 015



WEB COPY



W.P(MD).No.20670 of 2021

R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

msa

Pre-delivery order made in

W.P.(MD).No.20670 of 2021
and WMP(MD).Nos.17291, 17292 and 17294 of 2021
and WMP(MD).No.21674 of 2022
and WMP(MD).No.22491 of 2023

07.11.2023