



W.A.(MD).No.932 of 2017

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : **06.03.2024**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MRS.JUSTICE V.BHAVANI SUBBAROYAN**

and

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN**

W.A.(MD).No.932 of 2017

and

C.M.P.(MD).No.6287 of 2017

1.The Director General of Police,
Tamil Nadu,
Kamarajar Salai,
Mylapore,
Chennai 600 004.

2.The Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Trichirappalli District.

... Appellants

Vs.

P.Balu (Retired HC 2192)

... Respondent

PRAYER: Writ Appal is filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent Act, against the order passed by this Court in W.P.(MD).No.1323 of 2012, dated 28.11.2013.

For Appellants : Mr.A.K.Manikkam

Special Government Pleader

For Respondent : Mr.G.Thalaimutharasu



W.A.(MD).No.932 of 2017

JUDGMENT

WEB COPY

(Judgment of the Court was delivered by **V.BHAVANI SUBBAROYAN, J.**)

The State has filed this writ appeal against the order of the learned single Judge passed in W.P.(MD).No.1323 of 2012, dated 28.11.2013.

2. The respondent is the writ petitioner in the above writ petition. The challenge made in the writ petition is to the order of rejection of upgradation passed by the first respondent therein in Na.Ka.No.263269/NGB 3 (2)/2011 dated 05.12.2011. The learned single Judge of this Court allowed the writ petition. Aggrieved over the said order, the present writ appeal has been filed by the State.

3. According to the appellants, the learned single Judge has directed the appellants to consider the claim of the petitioner by giving him upgradation, based on the G.O.(Ms.).No.844 Home (Pol.5) Department, dated 03.06.1997 and G.O.(Ms.)No.15, Home (Pol.5) Department, dated 07.01.2010, without considering the fact that the upgradation was introduced in the Police Department only during the year 1992-1993, through the issuance of G.O.



W.A.(MD).No.932 of 2017

(Ms).No.1681, Home (Pol.5) Department, dated 12.10.1992. Further, the Government, vide G.O.(Ms.).No.844 Home (Pol.V) Department, dated 03.07.1997, has introduced the time bound upgradation scheme. Accordingly, the Grade - II Police Constable, those who have completed ten years of service can be upgraded as Grade - I Police Constable and Grade - I Police Constable, those who have completed five years of service can be upgraded as Head Constable. The above time bound upgradation scheme introduced by the Government can be given effect only from the date of issuance of Government Order and not with retrospective effect. Further, the writ petitioner has not completed ten years of service in the category of Head Constable. Moreover, he retired on superannuation in the post of Head Constable. As such, his name cannot be considered for upgradation as Special Sub Inspector of Police.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the respondent/writ petitioner would submit that similar matters are pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and his case should be considered positively.

5. Heard the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the appellants and the learned counsel appearing for the respondent/writ petitioner.



W.A.(MD).No.932 of 2017

WEB COPY

6. The Full Bench of this Court in the case of *State of Tamil Nadu and others vs. C.Srinivasan* in *W.A.Nos.3748 of 2019, 1813 to 1815 of 2015, 1193 of 2016, 1246 and 1247 of 2016*, dated **04.02.2022**, had decided that the writ petitioner cannot be upgraded as there is no deemed upgradation or deemed promotion contemplated in the relevant Government Orders and the benefit of upgradation/promotion to the next level can be granted /claimed only on completion of the qualifying service in each level/rank as prescribed in the relevant Government Orders. At the risk of repetition, insofar as understanding the expression “retrospective operation” is concerned, we hold that the Government Orders operate prospectively, but it imposes/grants new results in respect of a past event. In other words, the Government Order operates forward but it looks backward and in that it attaches new consequences for the future to an event that took place before the Government Order was issued. If the Government Orders are understood in this perspective, there is no need to get into the issue of “retrospective operation. Thus, we are of the view that the Division Bench while rendering the judgment in *V.Ramachandran* case has dealt with the Government Orders in its proper perspective and the judgment in *V.Samy* case is hereby overruled”.



W.A.(MD).No.932 of 2017

7. In view of the decision of the Full Bench of this Court, the writ petitioner has got no legs to stand before this Court regarding the upgradation retrospectively. Hence, this Writ Appeal is allowed and if any favourable order is passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in similar matters, then it is left open to the respondent/writ petitioner to proceed as per law. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

[V.B.S.,J.] [K.K.R.K.,J.]
06.03.2024

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
NCC : Yes/No
sm



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD).No.932 of 2017

V.BHAVANI SUBBAROYAN,J.
and
K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.

sm

Judgment made in
W.A.(MD).No.932 of 2017

Dated:
06.03.2024