



WEB COPY

W.P.No.11760 of 2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on	04.01.2024
Pronounced on	03.04.2024

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE Ms.JUSTICE **R.N.MANJULA**

W.P.No.11760 of 2021
and
WMP.Nos. 12523 &12524 of 2021

M.S.K. Surya

...

Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Handlooms, Handicrafts, Textiles & Khadi,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner,
Department of Handlooms & Textiles,
Kuralagam II floor,
Chennai - 600 108.
3. The Director,
Department of Handlooms & Textiles,
Kuralagam-II Floor,
Chennai- 600 108.
4. P.Matheeswaran,
Deputy Director/Managing Director,
EH 131, Kalikavalasu



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

Handloom Weavers Co-op. Society,
Erode.

5. V.K.Anandha Kumar,
Deputy Director (Textiles),
O/O. Directorate/ Commissionerate
Handloom & Textiles Kuralagam,
II Floor, Chennai-600 108.
6. K. Thiruvassagar,
Assistant Director/Assistant Enforcement Officer,
O/o. Assistant Enforcement Office of
Handloom & Textiles,
Madurai-20.
7. S. A.Gopinath,
Assistant Director,
O/o. Assistant Director of Handlooms
and Textiles, No.26,
Lalbhadur Sastri Road,Periyakuppam,
(near Railway Station) Thiruvallur-1
- 8.M.Ravindiran,
Assistant Director/Managing Director,
C.H. 123 Cholan Handloom
Weavers Co.op. Society,
Coimbatore.
9. G.Sangareswari,
Assistant Director,
O/o. Assistant Director of Handlooms
and Textiles, Collectorate Complex,
Kokkirakulam,
Thirunelveli-627 009.



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

10. S.Srilatha,

WEB COPY

Assistant Director,(Textiles),
O/o. Directorate/ Commissionerate of
Handlooms & Textiles,
Kuralagam-II Floor,
Chennai 600 108.

11. V. Vijayalakshmi,
Assistant Director,
O/o.Assistant Director of Handlooms
and Textiles, No.16E,
Salem Main Road,
Vengamedu,
Karur - 6.

12. P.Tamilarasi,
Assistant Director/Managing Director,
AA 128, Palla Kattu Puthur HWCS
Chennimalai - 638 051.

13. R. Sridharan,
Assistant Director/Managing Director,
K 905 Vadambacherry
Sri Ramalinga Choodambiga Handloom
Weavers Co-op. Society, 4/340,
Chinna Vadambacherry Sular Taluk,
Coimbatore District Pin 641 669 ...

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 proceedings of the 3rd respondent herein vide Na.ka.No.6594/2020/E-1, dated 12.11.2020 (effective



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

from 01.03.2020) and the proceedings of the 2nd respondent vide Na.Ka.No.6424/2021/E1 dated 04.03.2021 (effective from 01.03.2021) with regard to the revised seniority lists and quash them and further direct the respondents 2 and 3 herein to re-fix the seniority list of the petitioner as per Rule 35 (a) and 35 (aa) of the Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules.

For Petitioner : M/S.P.S.Sivashanmugasundaram

For Respondents : Mr.M.Rajendaran,
Additional Government Pleader
for RR1 to 3
: Mr.S.Silambannan,
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Ms.A.Shanthi
for RR4to 11 & 13
: No appearance for R12.

ORDER

Heard Mr.P.S.Sivashanmugasundaram, learned Counsel for the petitioner and Mr.M.Rajendaran, learned Additional Government Pleader for respondents 1 to 3, Mr.S.Silambannan, learned Additional Advocate General for the respondents 4 to 13 and there is no appearance on behalf of 12th respondent and perused the materials available on records.



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

WEB COPY

2. This Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus has been filed by the petitioner to challenge the proceedings of the 3rd respondent herein vide Na.ka.No.6594/2020/E-1, dated 12.11.2020 (effective from 01.03.2020) and the proceedings of the 2nd respondent vide Na.Ka.No.6424/2021/E1 dated 04.03.2021 (effective from 01.03.2021) with regard to the revised seniority lists and quash them and further direct the respondents 2 and 3 herein to re-fix the seniority list of the petitioner as per Rule 35 (a) and 35 (aa) of the Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules.

3. The petitioner is working as an Assistant Director in the Department of Handlooms and Textiles at Tiruvarur. She was directly recruited to the post of Assistant Director through TNPSC Vide Notification No.24/2016 dated 15.12.2016 TNPSC had called for applications from the eligible candidates for filling up of 12 vacant posts of Assistant Directors in the Department of Handlooms and Textiles for the years 2007-2008, 2010-2011, 2012-2013, 2015-2016



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

and 2016-2017. by subsequent Addendum Notification No.24A dated

06.01.2017 the number of vacancies was increased from 12 to 14.

The petitioner got intimation letter about her selection on 14.11.2017.

Though the Government has issued GO.MS.No.30 dated 19.02.2018

with regard to the petitioner's appointment, the 3rd respondent has

sent an order to the petitioner to join the training for the post of

Assistant Director of Handlooms and Textiles on 02.04.2018.

Through another government order in G.O No.32 dated 19.02.2018,

13 other candidates had also been appointed for the same post.

4. After the petitioner underwent training from 02.04.2018 to 31.03.2019, she was appointed as Managing Director/Assistant Director of Kanchipuram Dr. Kalaingar Silk Handloom Weavers Cooperative Society and Kanchi Silk Handloom Weavers Cooperative Society with effect from 01.04.2019. The petitioner was given an additional charge of Thiruvannamalai circle with effect from 14.05.2019 and then appointed regularly as Thiruvannamalai Circle Assistant Director with effect from 19.07.2019. At present the petitioner is working at Tiruvarur from 04.07.2020.



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

WEB COPY

5. The appointment to the post of Assistant Director has been prescribed under the special rules for Tamil Nadu Handlooms & Textiles Services. As per the said rules, the vacancies in the cadre of Assistant Director of Handlooms & Textiles shall be filled by direct recruitment and recruitment by transfer in the ratio of 1:5. As per G.O.Ms.No.153, Handlooms, Handicrafts, Textiles and Khadi (E2) Department dated 12.10.2007, 14 direct recruits have been appointed to the post of Assistant Directors (Handlooms and Textiles) and 17 promotees (Textile Control Officers and Senior Technical Assistants) for temporary list for promotion to the post of Assistant Director of Handlooms and Textiles have been proposed vide G.O.No.222 dated 16.10.2017 and they were subsequently approved vide G.O.No.249 dated 14.11.2017. They joined for duty on 15.11.2017 as Assistant Director of Handlooms and Textiles.

6. The 2nd respondent issued proceedings in Na.ka No. 6924 /2019/ E-1 dated 05.03.2019 and published a seniority list as per



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

Rule 35 (a) of the Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules which has to be taken effect from 01.03.2019. All direct recruits were placed above the promotees and the petitioner's seniority number was 23. However, a corrected seniority list was published by the 3rd respondent vide his proceedings Naka No. 6924/2019/E-1 dated 27.03.2019 in order to correct a wrong position given to one C.Rajendran. Even in the corrected seniority list all the direct recruits were placed above the promotees. The names of the direct recruits were placed from serial No. 21 to 33 and the promotees were placed below from 34 to 47.

7. Subsequently, the respondents 4 to 13 who are promotees have made representation to the 3rd respondent requesting that they be placed above the direct recruits in the seniority list. So the 3rd respondent published seniority list on 12.11.2020 which has taken effect from 01.03.2020. In the said seniority list the respondents 4 to 13 were placed above the direct recruits from serial Nos.12 to 22.

8. The grievance of the petitioner is that the above revised



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

seniority list was released without giving any opportunity to the direct recruits and that the 3rd respondent has published the seniority list for the year 2021 without following the Rule 35(a) of Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Service Rules which is detrimental to the interest of all the direct recruits.

9. It is submitted that the petitioner and the similar other direct recruits have given a representation in this regard to the 3rd respondent on 22.11.2020; but it has not been considered so far. However, based on the impugned seniority list, the respondents 4 & 5, have accorded promotion to the promotees to the post of Deputy Director post. Prior to the appointment of the Assistant Director Handlooms and Textiles by recruitment through transfer, the respondents Nos.4 to 9 & 11 to 13 were working as Textile Control Officers and they did not complete two years of qualifying service as Textile Control Officers to be appointed to the post of Assistant Directors.

10. But the said Rule 3 (3) of the special rules for Tamil Nadu



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

Handlooms & Textiles Service Rules have been relaxed in favour of the respondents Nos.4 to 9 & 11 to 13. They did not complete 3 months management training as senior technical assistants. However, Rule 11 (a) (2) of special rules for Tamil Nadu Handlooms & Textiles Subordinate Service Rules was relaxed in favour of the respondents Nos.4 to 9 & 11 to 13 and they were subsequently appointed to the posts of Assistant Directors by transfer for the year 2017-2018.

11. The Government issued G.O (MS) No. 249 dated 14.11.2017 to accept the list of respondents 4 to 13. So the claim of the petitioner is that the respondents 4 to 13 were promoted only on temporary basis and that their promotions were not regularized so far. It is further submitted that the 3rd respondent had arbitrarily revised the seniority list on 12.11.2020 and due to which the respondents 4 to 13 are now working as Deputy Directors.

12. As per the submission of the petitioner the seniority to the promotees will start from the date of their regularization till the date of their initial temporary appointment. Even if their promotion has



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

been regularized by giving retrospective effect, from the date of their initial appointment, they cannot claim seniority over and above the direct recruits and if such things are permitted, that is abuse of power. So the legitimate expectation of the direct recruits to be promoted to the next higher post in accordance with rules have been defeated in view of placing the respondents 4 to 13 with a better priority in the seniority list.

13. Mr.S.Silambannan, learned Additional Advocate General submitted that the petitioner's appointment had taken place subsequent to the appointment of respondents 4 to 13. The petitioner has been appointed on 19.02.2018 vide G.O.Ms. 32, Handlooms, Handicrafts, Textiles and Khadi (E2) Department, dated 19.02.2018. However the respondents 4 to 13 were appointed in the year 2017 itself vide G.O.Ms.No.249, Handlooms, Handicrafts, Textiles and Khadi (E2) Department, dated 14.11.2017.

14. Even though the respondents 4 to 13 were temporarily appointed as Assistant Directors as intimated in the government



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

order, the promotion was made based on the estimate of the vacancy for the post of Assistant directors, by recruitment by transfer for the year 2017-2018 approved by the government vide GO.184, Handlooms, Handicrafts, Textiles and Khadi (E2) Department, dated 02.08.2017. Regularization is not a criteria for fixing the seniority in the cadre of Assistant Director and it is the date of joining which is the criteria for fixing the seniority.

15. As far as the petitioner's department is concerned, the government has been issued regularization order in the cadre of Assistant Directors up to the year 1991-1992 and it is in the process of regularization of subsequent panel years from 1992 to 1993 onwards. Due to various administrative reasons however, the government is continuously issuing promotional panel every year by mentioning the word 'temporarily promoted'.

16. According to Section 40(2) of the Tamil Nadu Government Servants (Conditions of Service) Act, 2016, the date of appointment is



a criterion for the purpose of fixing seniority and it is extracted below:

"The Seniority of a person in a service, class, category or grade shall, where the normal method of recruitment to that service, class, category or grade is by more than one method of recruitment, unless the individual has been reduced to a lower rank as a punishment, be determined with reference to the date on which he is appointed to the services, class, category or grade".

17. Out to 10 respondents, only 4 persons (i.e) respondents 4,7,9 & 13 are now working in the Handloom Department. The total cadre strength of Assistant Director is 46; the working strength is 30 and the vacancy position was 16. The promotees have been absorbed only against the regular vacancies and they have completed more than five and half years in the cadre of Assistant Director and hence, they are eligible for the next level of promotion, i.e. to the post of Deputy Director. Hence the seniority list published on 12.11.2022 is legally sustainable.



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

WEB COPY

18. It is further submitted that the writ petitioner has been charged with two criminal proceedings in Crime No. 24/2021 by DVAC in Coimbatore V&AC and Crime No.1/2022 by DVAC in Tiruvannamalai V&AC.

19. The respondents 4 to 13 have been promoted to the post of Assistant Director through appointment by transfer. The petitioner has been appointed through direct recruitment. It is not in dispute that the petitioner's appointment order has been issued vide G.O.Ms. 32, Handlooms, Handicrafts, Textiles and Khadi (E2) Department, dated 19.02.2018 and the respondents 4 to 13 have been appointed vide G.O.Ms.No.249, Handlooms, Handicrafts, Textiles and Khadi (E2) Department, dated 14.11.2017. Admittedly, the respondents 4 to 9 and 11 to 13 have been promoted before the petitioner got recruited and her appointment order was issued.

20. It is also not in dispute that the ratio between the direct



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

recruits and the appointment made by transfer is in the ratio of 1:5.

The only claim now made by the petitioner is that the promotion given to the respondents 4 to 9 and 11 to 13 was only temporary promotion and that they were not regularised since 1997 onwards. The petitioner also claimed about the relaxation of rules in respect of qualification while giving appointment to the promotees. In fact the relaxation has been given to recruits through transfer by issuing G.O.Ms.NO.222 dated 16.10.2017. The above Government Order has been issued even before the petitioner borne into the department.

21. There is a fundamental difference between the appointment made by transfer and the appointment made by promotion. In the case in hand, what is being dealt is the appointment which is made by transfer. Even according to the petitioner, appointment to the post of Assistant Director Handlooms and textiles is being made from two categories, namely, direct recruitment and recruitment by transfer. In the total cadre strength for Assistant Director Handlooms and textiles, one post is earmarked for Direct Recruitment, five posts are



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

earmarked for appointment through transfer, as per G.O.Ms.No.153 Handlooms, Handicrafts, Textiles and Khadi (E2) Department, dated 12.10.2017.

22. Even though the government order in G.O.Ms.No.222 dated 16.10.2017 mentions the words ' a temporarily list', the appointment was not made temporarily. The approval given to the temporary list vide G.O.Ms.No.222, Handlooms, Handicrafts, Textiles and Khadi (E2) Department, dated 16.10.2017 does not state that the respondents 4 to 13 have been appointed on any adhoc basis.

23. The petitioner placed reliance on the Division bench judgement of this Court held in **WA.No.2537 and 2612 of 2019 dated 23.12.2020** / *The government of Tamil Nadu rep. by its Chief Secretary and ors Vs. J.Ganesan, Under Secretary to Government, Home Department and ors* wherein it is held that special rules governing the service of any department candidates will



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

prevail over the general rules and that the promotee officers who were officiating temporary posts cannot claim seniority over the direct recruits who have been appointed against the substantive posts. So the criteria to decide the entitlement of seniority is whether a person has been appointed as against substantive vacancies or on a temporary basis due to any administrative contingency.

24. In administrative functions *ad hoc* promotions are given when there are no sufficient candidates available to fill up the post earmarked for direct recruitment and the exigency of services require the post be filled up immediately. During such case, the feeder category officers will be appointed on *ad-hoc* promotion and their promotion will be regularised once vacancy arises as against the vacancy earmarked for them. In the meanwhile, if the direct recruits are recruited then the *ad hoc* promotee will be reverted back to his feeder category by leaving the post he occupied so far to the direct recruits.

25. But in the case on hand it is not the claim of the respondent



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

department that the respondents 4 to 13 have been accommodated only as against their substantive vacancies even though the government order adopts the word '*temporarily list*'. No doubt the petitioner and her batch mates have been appointed subsequent to the appointment made to the respondents 4 to 13; the claim for seniority by the direct recruits, the position of law has been well settled that he cannot claim seniority from a date before he has borne into the service.

26. In the case of *N.K.Chauhan Vs. State of Gujarat* [reported in (1977) 1 SCC 308] the Honble Supreme Court has settled this principle stating that the later direct recruits cannot claim deemed dates of appointment for seniority with effect from the time when direct recruitment vacancy arises. Seniority will depend upon length of service. In the case in hand, it is submitted by the learned counsel for the respondent government that even though the regularisation orders for respondents 4 to 13 were released at a later point of time they have been appointed only as against the vacancy earmarked to



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

them and hence, they are within the number of vacancies earmarked against the transferees / promotees to the post of Assistant Director Handlooms and Textiles. The petitioner has not stated that the respondents 4 to 13 have occupied the post of Assistant Director Handlooms and Textiles over and above the fixed ratio of 1:5.

27. Just because the regularisation order for the transferees / promotees has not been released due to administrative reasons, but they continue to work in the cadre strength earmarked against them, the direct recruits cannot claim that their recruitment itself is illegal and that the direct recruits should be given primacy in the matter of seniority over and above the respondents 4 to 13.

28. In fact many of the transferees who have been appointed in the year 2017 have either retired or have been promoted. As on today only four persons are available from the original list of transferees in the post of Assistant Director:



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

Respondent No	Name	Present Status
4	P. Matheeswaran	Working as Deputy Director in Handlooms Department.
5	V.K.Ananthakumar	Promoted as Deputy Director and transferred to newly formed Textiles Department.
6	K. Thiruvassagar	working as Assistant Director in newly formed Textiles Department.
7	S.A.Goppinat (Date of Retirement 31.03.2026)	working as Assistant Director Department in Handlooms Department.
8	M.Ravindran	Retired
9	G.Sangareswari (Date of Retirement 30.06.2034)	Working as Assistant Director in Handlooms Department.
10	S.Srilatha	Retired (VRS)
11	V. Vijayalakshmi	Retired
12	P. Tamilarasi	Retired
13	R.Sridharan (Date of Retirement 31.03.2033)	working as Assistant in Handlooms Department.

29. The seniority would relate back to the date of appointment and not from the date on which the vacancy arises. Undoubtedly, the



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

appointment of respondents 4 to 13 was done prior to the petitioner's entry into service. In fact the respondents 4 to 13 have started to function in the cadre of Assistant Director Handlooms and Textiles before the petitioner and her batchmates entered into service. However, it appears that in the seniority list the promotees and the direct recruits were placed '*enmass*' without following *quota rota* system. This might be due to appointments through direct recruits are made at irregular intervals.

30. Even in such case of leaving the slot earmarked for the direct recruits in the list of seniority, the person who have been appointed at a later point of time cannot claim seniority over and above the persons who are already appointed irrespective of the category for which the appointment had taken place. It is reiteration of the principle that the direct recruit cannot claim seniority from the date on which the vacancy arises but from the date on which his appointment is fixed. Naturally when the vacancies for next level of promotion, which requires eligible years of service in the existing



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

category, the persons who was appointed earlier will become eligible irrespective of whether he was appointed through direct mode or through transfer mode.

31. It is worthwhile to make a reference about the judgement of ***B.S.Murthy & Others Vs. A.Ravinder Singh & others*** reported in (2022) 14 SCC 119. In the said case it is held as under:

54.... The appellants in the said case were promoted in a regular manner having been regularized in service with retrospective effect. Their services were not regularized from the date of their initial ad hoc promotion but with effect from the date when the vacancies became available. Their services after regularization would not be by way of a stop- gap arrangement. The direct recruits who were appointed in the years 1990 and 1991, in terms of Item 3 of Annexure 'A' would be considered to have been appointed only after their successful completion of training. They were borne in the cadre in the years 1990-91 and, thus, prior thereto they cannot claim seniority. The learned third Judge, dissenting with the learned two Judges, has held that the direct recruit can claim seniority from the date of his regular appointment, he cannot claim seniority from a date when he was not borne in the service. Thus, the direct recruits of 1990 and 1991, by reason of the impugned seniority list, could not have been placed over and above the appellants-promotees because the



purported quota and rota rule contained in Item 3 of Annexure 'A' could not have been given effect to because the State Government had imposed total ban for direct recruitment from the year 1977 to 1988. In such a situation, the said quota rule became inoperative. We agree with the dissenting view of the learned Judge that in the facts of the case, the quota rule became inoperative because the direct recruits were borne in the cadre when they were appointed against the vacancies meant for them.” The judgment in [Pawan Pratap Singh v. Reevan Singh](#)²⁵ considered several previous precedents, on the issue, including the Constitution Bench decision in [Direct Recruit Class II Engg. Officers' Assn. v. State of Maharashtra](#) ²⁶. The correct position was summarized by Lodha, J. in the following manner:

“(i) The effective date of selection has to be understood in the context of the service rules under which the appointment is made. It may mean the date on which the process of selection starts with the issuance of advertisement or the factum of preparation of the select list, as the case may be.

2011 (2) SCR 831- a view followed later, in [State of U.P. v. Ashok Kumar Srivastava](#), (2014) 14 SCC 720 and, more recently, endorsed in [K. Meghachandra Singh v. Ningam Siro](#) (2020) 5 SCC 689 that “seniority should not be reckoned retrospectively unless it is so expressly provided by the relevant Service Rules. The Supreme Court held that seniority cannot be given to an employee who is yet to be borne in the cadre and by doing so it may adversely affect the employees who have been appointed validly in the meantime”. Also [Dinesh Kumar Gupta & Ots v High Court of Judicature, Rajasthan](#) 2020 SCC OnLine (SC) 420 (1990) 2 SCR 900

(ii) Inter se seniority in a particular service has to be determined as per the service rules. The date of entry in a particular service or the date of substantive appointment is the safest criterion for fixing seniority inter se between one officer or the other or between one group of officers and the other recruited from different sources. Any departure therefrom in the statutory rules, executive instructions or otherwise must be



WEB COPY



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

consistent with the requirements of *Articles 14 and 16* of the Constitution.

(iii) Ordinarily, notional seniority may not be granted from the backdate and if it is done, it must be based on objective considerations and on a valid classification and must be traceable to the statutory rules.

(iv) The seniority cannot be reckoned from the date of occurrence of the vacancy and cannot be given retrospectively unless it is so expressly provided by the relevant service rules. It is so because seniority cannot be given on retrospective basis when an employee has not even been borne in the cadre and by doing so it may adversely affect the employees who have been appointed validly in the meantime.”

32. In fact, the hon'ble Supreme Court judgment which has referred the above judgment as reported in **2020(5) SCC 689 [L.Meghachnadra Singh & Others Vs. Ningam Siro & others]** has made it categorically clear that seniority should not be reckoned retrospectively unless it is so expressly provided in the relevant service rules. In fact the said judgment is followed the principle settled in the earlier judgment that an employee who is yet to be born in the cadre cannot be given seniority over and above the employees who are already in service and whose appointment are validly made.

33. Just because some relaxation was given before appointing



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

the respondents 4 to 13 it cannot render their appointment as illegal unless the person challenging such appointment has been in service at the relevant point of time and got aggrieved due to such relaxation. So far as the petitioner is concerned she was a third party, with regard to the time when the relaxation has been made. Administrative contingencies would demand certain relaxation of rules and the petitioner who was a third party at that point of time and who did not have any employer and employee relationship with the respondents 1 to 3 department, cannot choose to challenge the same at a remote point of time.

34. As stated already there is a fundamental difference between the *ad-hoc* appointment or the appointment made against substantive vacancies and for which order for regularization are being issued at a later point of time. since the respondents 4 to 13 have been appointed as against the cadre strength and the petitioner and her batch have not been appointed at the time when the appointment was made in respect of the respondents 4 to 13, the petitioner cannot claim



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

seniority over and above the respondents 4 to 13. Even if the positions are earmarked in the list by strictly following the quota rota, the persons selected as against each category can be simply placed in the list as against the vacancy earmarked for them but without giving any priority in promotion to the next post. This is in view of the appointment for the direct recruits have been made on a later date.

35. In the instant case, the petitioner challenged the earlier appointments made to the respondents 4 to 13 on the premise that their appointments are temporary in nature and the date of regularization has got an impact in the matter of seniority. Such an argument may be correct if the appointment of the respondents 4 to 13 had been made against the vacancies earmarked for the direct recruits and they had been appointed an ad hoc basis through promotion.

36. Even in that case, if the substantive vacancies arise before direct recruitment takes place, the direct recruits cannot claim seniority over and above the said promotees by stating that the



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

WEB COPY

vacancy as against direct recruits has arisen before the vacancy against which the regularization of promotees had been made. A slight difference in the case in hand is that the respondents 1 to 3 are yet to issue the order of regularization to the respondents 4 to 13 even though they have been appointed as against their substantive vacancies and their occupation in the post of Assistant Director Handloom and Textiles does not exceed the cadre strength earmarked to the category of recruitment through transfer. So in any legal and practical term, the petitioner is not entitled to claim seniority over and above the respondents 4 to 13 in view of their appointment and joining into service.

In the result, this Writ Petition stands **dismissed**. No costs. consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

03.04.2024

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking
Neutral Citation : Yes/No



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

jrs
WEB COPY

To

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Handlooms, Handicrafts, Textiles & Khadi,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Commissioner,
Department of Handlooms & Textiles,
Kuralagam II floor,
Chennai - 600 108.
3. The Director,
Department of Handlooms & Textiles,
Kuralagam-II Floor,
Chennai- 600 108.
4. P.Matheeswaran,
Deputy Director/Managing Director,
EH 131, Kalikavalasu
Handloom Weavers Co-op. Society,
Erode.
5. V.K.Anandha Kumar,
Deputy Director (Textiles),
O/O. Directorate/ Commissionerate
Handloom & Textiles Kuralagam,
II Floor, Chennai-600 108.
6. K. Thiruvassagar,
Assistant Director/Assistant Enforcement Officer,
O/o. Assistant Enforcement Office of
Handloom & Textiles,



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

Madurai-20.

WEB COPY

7. S. A.Gopinath,
Assistant Director,
O/o. Assistant Director of Handlooms
and Textiles, No.26,
Lalbhadr Sastri Road,Periyakuppam,
(near Railway Station) Thiruvallur-1
- 8.M.Ravindiran,
Assistant Director/Managing Director,
C.H. 123 Cholan Handloom
Weavers Co.op. Society,
Coimbatore.
9. G.Sangareswari,
Assistant Director,
O/o. Assistant Director of Handlooms
and Textiles, Collectorate Complex,
Kokkirakulam,
Thirunelveli-627 009.
10. S.Srilatha,
Assistant Director,(Textiles),
O/o. Directorate/ Commissionarate of
Handlooms & Textiles,
Kuralagam-II Floor,
Chennai 600 108.
11. V. Vijayalakshmi,
Assistant Director,
O/o.Assistant Director of Handlooms
and Textiles, No.16E,
Salem Main Road,
Vengamedu,
Karur - 6.



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

WEB COPY

12. P.Tamilarasi,
Assistant Director/Managing Director,
AA 128, Palla Kattu Puthur HWCS
Chennimalai - 638 051.

13. R. Sridharan,
Assistant Director/Managing Director,
K 905 Vadambacherry
Sri Ramalinga Choodambiga Handloom
Weavers Co-op. Society, 4/340,
Chinna Vadambacherry Sulur Taluk,
Coimbatore District Pin 641 669



WEB COPY



W.P.No.11760 of 2021

R.N.MANJULA, J.

jrs

W.P.No.11760 of 2021

and

WMP.Nos. 12523 &12524 of 2021

03.04.2024