



W.P.(MD)No.14770 of 2016

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 07.02.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

W.P.(MD)No.14770 of 2016

K. Vanitha

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Director of Board Apprentice,
Tharamani,
Chennai.

2. The General Manager,
Tamilnadu State Transport Corporation,
Kumbakonam Kottam,
Karaikudi.

3. The Branch Manager,
Tamilnadu State Transport Corporation,
Kumbakonam Kottam,
Madurai Branch.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to allow the petitioner to continue the petitioner training as an apprentice following the order of the 2nd respondent in TNSTC/ADMIN/P1/59, dated 09.04.2015 for the remaining period.



WEB COPY

W.P.(MD)No.14770 of 2016

For Petitioner : No appearance
For R-2 & R-3 : Mr.D.Sivaraman
Standing Counsel

ORDER

This writ petition is filed for Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to allow the petitioner to continue training as Apprentice, following the order, dated 09.04.2015, passed by the 2nd respondent.

2. The learned Standing counsel appearing for the respondents submitted that the petitioner was provisionally selected as Apprentice and executed a contract for a period of one year, i.e., from 10.04.2015 to 09.04.2016. In the meanwhile, the 2nd respondent has received a communication from the 1st respondent, who is an appropriate authority for approving the Apprenticeship Training, wherein it is stated that the petitioner is not eligible, since apprenticeship training could be granted within a period of 3 years from the date of completion of course. The petitioner has misled the respondents, by stating that



W.P.(MD)No.14770 of 2016

WEB COPY

she has completed the course in the year 2013, but, the fact remains that the petitioner has completed the course in the year 2010 itself, which is beyond three years period. Based on the communication, the 2nd respondent has prevented the petitioner from continuing.

3. In view of the foregoing reasons, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner's claim cannot be considered and it is beyond the Rules prescribed.

4. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes
ksa

07.02.2023



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.14770 of 2016

S.SRIMATHY, J

ksa

**Order made in
W.P.(MD)No.14770 of 2016**

07.02.2023