



WEB COPY

W.P.No.4603 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.02.2024

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM
and**

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

W.P.No.4603 of 2024

and

W.M.P.No.5042 of 2024

R.Ramprasath

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The High Court of Madras,
Rep. By the Registrar General,
High Court Campus, Chennai – 104.

2. The Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission,
Rep. By its Secretary,
VOC Nagar, Park Town,
Chennai – 9.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to reconsider the marks allotted to the petitioner by the Honourable Committee Members during the interview/viva voce, re-calculate them to avoid any arithmetic errors, re-evaluate the records including computer entries publish the same afresh and consider his name or the post of Civil Judge under BC (OBCM)(G) category as per the marks scored by him in the Interview/viva voce conducted on 31.01.2024 by considering the petitioners e-mail



WEB COPY

W.P.No.4603 of 2



representation dated 12.02.2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Manokaran
For R1 : Mr.B.Vijay
For R2 : Mr.R.Bharanidharan,
Standing Counsel for TNPSC

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.**)

The learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr.N.Manoharan would submit that the writ petitioner performed well before the Selection Committee during the course of interview/viva-voce. However, to his shock, the writ petitioner secured 11 (eleven) marks in the interview/viva-voce. Thus, the writ petitioner has a reasonable apprehension that the marks actually awarded by the Selection Committee has not been carried out for the purpose of selection. The very objection is unacceptable in view of the fact that the statement of marks obtained during the interview/viva-voce has been signed by the Chairman and Member Committee. That being so, the apprehension of the writ petitioner is baseless.

2. In respect of the principles to be followed in the process of selection, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has held in the case of ***Tajvir Singh Sodhi -vs- the State of Jammu and Kashmir*** reported in **2023 LiveLaw (SC) 253** as follows:-



WEB COPY

W.P.No.4603 of 2



“12.1. Thus, the inexorable conclusion that can be drawn is that it is not within the domain of the Courts, exercising the power of judicial review, to enter into the merits of a selection process, a task which is the prerogative of and is within the expert domain of a Selection Committee, subject of course to a caveat that if there are proven allegations of malfeasance or violations of statutory rules, only in such cases of inherent arbitrariness, can the Courts intervene.

Thus, Courts while exercising the power of judicial review cannot step into the shoes of the Selection Committee or assume an appellate role to examine whether the marks awarded by the Selection Committee in the viva-voce are excessive and not corresponding to their performance in such test. The assessment and evaluation of the performance of candidates appearing before the Selection Committee/Interview Board should be best left to the members of the committee. In light of the position that a Court cannot sit in appeal against the decision taken pursuant to a reasonably sound selection process, the following grounds raised by the writ petitioners, which are based on an attack of subjective criteria employed by the selection



board/interview panel in assessing the suitability of candidates, namely, (i) that the candidates who had done their post-graduation had been awarded 10 marks and in the viva-voce, such PG candidates had been granted either 18 marks or 20 marks out of 20. (ii) that although the writ petitioners had performed exceptionally well in the interview, the authorities had acted in an arbitrary manner while carrying out the selection process, would not hold any water.

13.1. It is therefore trite that candidates, having taken part in the selection process without any demur or protest, cannot challenge the same after having been declared unsuccessful. The candidates cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time. In other words, simply because the result of the selection process is not palatable to a candidate, he cannot allege that the process of interview was unfair or that there was some lacuna in the process. Therefore, we find that the writ petitioners in these cases, could not have questioned before a Court of law, the rationale behind recasting the selection criteria, as they willingly took part in the selection process even after the criteria had been so recast. Their candidature was not withdrawn in light of the amended criteria. A challenge was thrown against the same only after they had been



declared unsuccessful in the selection process, at which stage, the challenge ought not to have been entertained in light of the principle of waiver and acquiescence.”

3. Accordingly, the Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs.

Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

(S.M.S.,J.) (K.R.S.,J.)
26.02.2024

skr
Index : Yes
Speaking order

To

1. The Registrar General,
The High Court of Judicature of Madras,
High Court Campus, Chennai – 104.
2. The Secretary, Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission,
VOC Nagar, Park Town,
Chennai – 9.



WEB COPY

W.P.No.4603 of 2



S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.
and
K.RAJASEKAR, J.

skr

W.P.No.4603 of 2024

26.02.2024