



Writ Petition No.18801 of 2015

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 16.06.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR

Writ Petition No.18801 of 2015

R.Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs

1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep by its Director,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
Chennai – 6.

2.The District Collector,
Collectorate, Villupuram District.

3.A.Sundaram
4.M.Senthilkumar

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the impugned proceedings Provisional selection List for oral interview for the post of Assistant Professors (Sub-code D19-Economics) in respect of 3rd and 4th respondents, Sl.No.50 and 57 in the impugned list and quash the same and consequently to direct the 1st respondent to consider the petitioner marks and to appoint him as Assistant Professors.



WEB COPY



Writ Petition No.18801 of 2015

For Petitioners : Mr.P.Vijendran

For Respondents : Mr.C.Kathiravan
Standing Counsel for TRB for R1
Mr.K.H.Ravikumar
Government Advocate for R2
Mr.S.Nedunchezhiyan for R3

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the selection and the appointment of the respondents 3 and 4 as Assistant Professor in Economics in Tamil Nadu Collegiate Educational Service against Scheduled Caste general category post on the ground that the petitioner has got more experience than the 3rd respondent and also contending that the 4th respondent is not qualified for being appointed the post of Assistant Professor for want of possession of SLET qualification.

2. According to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, the petitioner herein has seven years experience of teaching, whereas the 3rd respondent has only five years and seven months of experience. Therefore, the petitioner should have been preferred over the 3rd respondent. Insofar as, the 4th respondent is concerned it is contended that



WEB COPY

he should not have been selected for want of possession of SLET qualification. On the other hand, the first respondent filed counter affidavit contending that the petitioner herein had secured 14 marks for seven years teaching experience, four marks for interview and nine marks for qualification possessed by the petitioner, totalling 27. However, the cut-off marks for selection were 29 and thus the petitioner was not eligible for selection.

3. As seen from the records, the 3rd respondent has secured 31 marks and the 4th respondent secured 29 marks and therefore, the respondents 3 and 4 were selected. Based on the detailed particulars of the marks secured by the petitioner as well the respondents 3 and 4, there is nothing to show that there is any irregularity or illegality in the selection process. The petitioner as well as the respondents 3 and 4 belong to Scheduled Caste General category and respondents 3 and 4 have been selected against the posts earmarked for Scheduled Caste General category. The 4th respondent though does not possess SLET qualification, he had Ph.d degree and hence SLET is exempted.



Writ Petition No.18801 of 2015

WEB COPY

4. In the absence of any dispute regarding the fact that respondents 3 and 4 are more meritorious than the petitioner, this Court does not find any reason to interfere with the selection.

5. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

16.06.2025

Index : Yes/No
Speaking order: Yes/No
Neutral citation: Yes/No
ub



Writ Petition No.18801 of 2015

WEB COPY

To

1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep by its Director,
Teachers Recruitment Board,
Chennai – 6.

2.The District Collector,
Collectorate, Villupuram District.

MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR, J.



WEB COPY



Writ Petition No.18801 of 2015

ub

W.P.No.18801 of 2015

16.06.2025