



WEB COPY



W.P. No.36901 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25.09.2025

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.D. JAGADISH CHANDIRA

W.P. No.36901 of 2025

and

W.M.P.Nos.41283 and 41284 of 2025

Vikash Kumar

... Petitioner

vs.

1. Indian Institute of Technology Madras,
Represented by its Director,
I.I.T. P.O.,
Chennai-600 036.

2. The Registrar,
Indian Institute of Technology Madras,
I.I.T. P.O., Chennai-600 036.

3 . The Recruitment Section,
Represented by the Deputy Registrar (Recruitment),
Indian Institute of Technology Madras,
I.I.T. PO.,
Chennai-600 036.

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue Writ of Certiorari, call for the records of the 2nd respondent culminating in the Advertisement No: ITM/R/4/2025 dated 14.08.2025 and the



W.P. No.36901 of 2025

consequent e-mail communication dated 01.09.2025 issued by the 3rd respondent and quash the same in so far as the petitioner having application no. RA25DR0009057 is concerned and thereby render justice.

For petitioner : Mr.V.B. Gowwtham Thelak
For respondents : Mr. Karthik Rajan
for M/s. Menon Karthik
Mukundhan & Neelakandan

ORDER

Mr.Karthik Rajan, learned counsel on behalf of Mr.Menon Karthik, learned counsel, takes notice for the respondents 1 to 3. By consent of both the parties, this writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

2. This writ petition has been filed to call for the records of the 2nd respondent culminating in the Advertisement No: ITM/R/4/2025 dated 14.08.2025 and the consequent e-mail communication dated 01.09.2025 issued by the 3rd respondent and quash the same insofar as the petitioner having application no. RA25DR0009057 is concerned.

3. Short facts leading to the filing of this writ petition are as follows :-

The petitioner's case is that he had applied for the post of Deputy Registrar pursuant to the advertisement dated 16.04.2025 issued by the 1st



W.P. No.36901 of 2025

respondent / Institution. The petitioner was employed as Assistant

Commandant in the Border Security Force and presently, serving as a Translator Officer in Chinese in Signal Intelligence Directorate (SI DTE), Ministry of Defence, Government of India. It is his further case that he has cumulative administrative experience of about 13 years for fulfil the requisite qualification of experience to the said post. It is the contention of the petitioner that both posts viz., Assistant Registrar and Deputy Registrar are administrative in nature, which is evidenced from the experience certificates produced and that similarly situated candidates with Defence background have been considered for the same post in other IITs as IIT Kharagpur and IIT Gandhinagar. When that being the position, shockingly, his candidature for the post of Deputy Registrar was not shortlisted, vide email communication dated 01.09.2025 on the ground that his experience was not relevant to the post. Challenging the Advertisement dated 14.08.2025 and email communication dated 01.09.2025 issued by the 3rd respondent (relates to Application No.RA25DR0009057), this writ petition has been filed.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner commenced his arguments stating that as per the eligibility criteria, a candidate should possess five years of administrative experience in a post equivalent to Assistant Registrar in



W.P. No.36901 of 2025

Government or statutory organisations of high repute and the petitioner satisfied the said requirement and his candidature ought to have been selected.

However, without application of mind, rejection of the petitioner's candidature quoting “irrelevant experience” is highly arbitrary and illegal. He also submitted that before issuing the impugned email communication dated 01.09.2025, no opportunity was provided to the petitioner to show that he has got requisite experience.

5. He mainly argued that the candidates having service experience from Defence background are currently holding posts of Deputy Registrar in IITs and the first level of examination is scheduled to be held on 06.10.2025 and therefore, this Court may issue directions to the respondents to permit the petitioner to appear for the said examination. Hence, he prayed for allowing this writ petition by quashing the Advertisement/Notification issued by the 2nd respondent dated 14.08.2025 as well as the impugned email communication dated 01.09.2025 issued by the 3rd respondent. In view of the above, this Court may issue appropriate directions to the respondents.

6. Per contra, Mr. Karthik Rajan, learned counsel for the respondents 1 to 3 submitted that the last date for submission of representation on shortlisting along with relevant certificates was 19.08.2025 and any documents produced



W.P. No.36901 of 2025

beyond that date could not be considered. The petitioner admittedly submitted

an experience certificate only on 13.09.2025, beyond the cut-off date. The

learned counsel further submits that the screening committee, comprising members with administrative and technical knowledge, after due scrutiny of around 375 applications, short-listed only 70 candidates who satisfied the eligibility conditions. The petitioner's experience as Assistant Commandant in BSF and Translator Officer in the Ministry of Defence was not found to be equivalent in nature or level to the post of Assistant Registrar, and therefore, his candidature was rejected. He further submitted that each IIT is an independent legal entity governed by its own Board of Governors, and the petitioner cannot claim parity based on decisions taken by other IITs. He would further submit that prior to the issuance of the e-mail dated 01.09.2025, sufficient opportunity was afforded to the petitioner to put forth his grievance regarding any discrepancies in shortlisting and the same can be sent by way of representation with supporting documents. Therefore, the contention with regard to non-providing of an opportunity, before issuing the communication dated 01.09.2025 is baseless.

7. Relying upon the specific clause viz., Clause 2 in the Advertisement / Notification dated 14.08.2025, learned counsel for respondents 1 to 3



W.P. No.36901 of 2025

submitted that any representation received after the stipulated date and time shall not be entertained under any circumstances and therefore, the rejection of candidature of the petitioner by not short-listing his name is legally sustainable and interference at this stage would open the Pandora's box that too, when the process is going on and hall tickets have been issued to selected persons viz., 25 candidates.

8. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions and perused the records.

9. It is not in dispute that as per the Advertisement dated 14.08.2025, the last for submission of relevant experience certificates was 19.08.2025. On a bare perusal, it comes to light that the petitioner has produced the certificate dated 13.09.2025, i.e., beyond the prescribed cut-off period. When the terms of the notification specifically require all documents to be furnished within the stipulated time-line, delay on the part of the petitioner in submitting the requisite documents cannot be excused.

10. Further, determination of whether a candidate's experience is relevant or equivalent to the post notified, is primarily within the purview of the employer viz., the screening committee, which cannot be interfered with as this Court is not an expert in this regard. Only when there is perversity in the orders



W.P. No.36901 of 2025

passed, this Court can interfere with the same by invoking powers vested under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, but the petitioner has not established anything with regard to the above aspect. From the submissions made by the learned counsel for the respondents, it is noted that the petitioner cannot equate his case with the candidates of other IITs, as each IIT is a separate entity and therefore the petitioner's submission by making a comparison with other IITs is rejected.

11. In the light of the above discussion, this Court is of the view that the petitioner's approach is clearly belated and the rejection of his candidature by the respondents does not suffer from any infirmity warranting interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

12. In the result, this writ petition stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

25.09.2025

($\frac{1}{2}$)

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
vsi2



WEB COPY



W.P. No.36901 of 2025

A.D. JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

vsi2

To

1. The Director,
Indian Institute of Technology Madras,
I.I.T. P.O.,
Chennai-600 036.

2. The Registrar,
Indian Institute of Technology Madras,
I.I.T. P.O., Chennai-600 036.

3. The Deputy Registrar (Recruitment),
The Recruitment Section,
Indian Institute of Technology Madras,
I.I.T. PO.,
Chennai-600 036.

W.P. No.36901 of 2025

and

W.M.P.Nos.41283 and 41284 of 2025

25.09.2025

($\frac{1}{2}$)