



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22-07-2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

WEB COPY

WP No. 26994 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 30298 OF 2025, WMP NO. 30299 OF 2025

K.Ramesh Kumar

S/o Kamatchi, 2/323g, Pandi Naga Veerapandi,
Thirumalpuram Post Madurai District

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The District Collector

O/o The District Collector Thirupathru District

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records in pertaining to the impugned order in Pa.Aa5 / 3871/ 2022 dated 27.12.2023 on the file of the Respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the Respondent No. 2 to appoint the petitioner for the post of Jeep Driver with the Respondent office by considering his application dated on 11.10.2023 within the time stipulated by this Hon"ble Court.

For Petitioner(s):

M/S. T.THIRUMURGAN

For Respondent(s):

MR.G.NANMARAN, S.G.P. FOR SOLE RESPONDENT

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed with the prayer to call for the records in pertaining to the impugned order in Pa.Aa5 / 3871/ 2022 dated 27.12.2023 on the file of the Respondent and quash the same as illegal and consequently direct the Respondent No. 2 to appoint the petitioner for the post of Jeep Driver with the Respondent office by considering his application dated on 11.10.2023 within the time stipulated by this



WEB COPY

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that based upon the notification dated 29.09.2023, the petitioner has applied for the post of driver. According to the said notification, belonging to the Adi-Dravidar community, the maximum age limit is 42 years. However, the petitioner's application was rejected on the ground that the petitioner got over age. Even according to the impugned letter dated 27.12.2023, the petitioner's age is 38 years one month and 16 days. Therefore, the contention of the petitioner is that the rejection order is arbitrary to the recruitment notification dated 29.09.2023.

3. At this juncture, the Special Government Pleader strongly objected and submitted that after the selection process is over, the petitioner has challenged the said impugned order with an inordinate delay.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

5. Though the Special Government Pleader is not in a position to confirm whether the selection process is over or not, however, the fact remains that the petitioner's rejection order has been served upon him on 11.10.2023. Now we are in July 2025. As the petitioner has filed the present writ petition challenging the rejection order having kept silence for a period of more than 19 months shows his torment



attitude and seeks the relief on the ground of delay. Hence, this Court of the view is that though the petitioner has got the case only because of the delay on the ground of creation of third party interest for appointment, this Court does not find any merits in favour of the petitioner.

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

Lbm

6.In the result, this Writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

22-07-2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Lbm

To

The District Collector

O/o The District Collector Thirupathru District

WP No. 26994 of 2025

AND

WMP NO. 30298 OF 2025, WMP NO. 30299 OF 2025



WEB COPY



22-01-2023