



WEB COPY

WP No. 40659 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 29-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE G.K. ILANTHIRAIYAN

WP No. 40659 of 2025

and

WMP.No.45585 of 2025

K.Mariappan

Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The State Of Tamilnadu
Rep. By Its Additional Chief Secretary
To Government , Rural Development
And Panchayat Raj Department, Fort
St.George Secretariat Chennai 09
- 2.The Commissioner Of Rural
Development And
Panchayat Raj, Directorate Of Rural
Development And Panchayat Raj,
Panagal Building Chennai 15
- 3.The District Collector
Nagapattinam District Nagapattinam
- 4.The Project Director
Rural Development And Panchayat Raj,



Nagapattinam Nagapattinam District

5.The Commissioner

Vedaranyam Panchayat Union,

Vedaranyam Nagapattinam District

Respondents

PRAYER Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus call for the records relating to the impugned orders issued by the 1st respondent in Letter No.15411/ PaA5/ (2) 2017- 12 dated 22.04.2025 and the subsequent impugned order issued by the 3rd respondent in Na.Ka.No. 5874/ Uoo.Va.2/ 2015 dated 20.05.2025 and to quash the same and consequently directing the respondents to pass orders for granting regularization of service of the petitioner from the date of appointment on 16.11.1994 in the regular sanctioned post, with all consequential and other attendant benefits, including arrears of salary and other pensionary benefits within a time frame to be fixed by this Honble court.

For Petitioner(s): S.Nedunchezhiyan

For Respondent: Mr.V.Jeevagiridharan, AGP for
R.1 to R.4
Mr.R.Vigneswaran, Govt.
Advocate for R.5.

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the orders passed by the 1st and the 3rd respondents dated 22.04.2025 and 20.05.2025 respectively, thereby



rejecting the request made by the petitioner seeking regularization of his service from the date of his appointment as an Office Assistant i.e.16.11.1994.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

3. The petitioner was initially appointed as Kalara Mazdoor on a daily wage basis on 13.06.1986. Subsequently, he worked as Godown Watchman on temporary basis. Thereafter, on 16.11.1994, as per Panchayat Resolution, he was appointed as Office Assistant. Thereafter, the 5th respondent passed a Resolution dated 10.03.2000 for the regularization of his service in the post of Office Assistant and submitted a proposal. However, the said proposal was not considered. Thereafter, he retired from service on 31.05.2025. After retirement, the petitioner submitted a representation seeking regularization of his appointment from the date of his appointment as an Office Assistant on 16.11.1994.



4. On perusal of the records, it is revealed that the petitioner was initially engaged as a Kalara Mazdoor only on a daily-wage basis. Thereafter, he was engaged as a Godown Watchman on a temporary basis. Subsequently, based on a resolution passed by the 5th respondent, he was appointed as an Office Assistant. The 5th respondent thereafter submitted a proposal seeking the regularization of his services in the post of Office Assistant. However, the said proposal was not considered even till his retirement. The petitioner remained silent until his retirement from service and only after retirement, he submitted a representation seeking regularization of his service from the date of his appointment as an Office Assistant. The said request was rejected by the impugned orders dated 22.04.2025 and 20.05.2025 on the grounds that the petitioner's name did not appear in G.O.Ms.No.161 dated 26.06.2000 for regularisation, and that his appointment was irregular and not made through the proper channel.

5. The petitioner's initial engagement was only on a daily-wage basis, and that too as a temporary worker and his subsequent appointment as Office



Assistant was only through a resolution passed by the 5th respondent.

Therefore, the petitioner's service cannot be regularized from the date of his appointment as Office Assistant, i.e., 16.11.1994.

6. Hence, this Court finds no illegality or infirmity in the impugned orders passed by the 1st and the 3rd respondents dated 22.04.2025 and 20.05.2025 respectively. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

29-10-2025

shr

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



To

WEB COPY

1.The State Of Tamilnadu

Rep. By Its Additional Chief Secretary
To Government , Rural Development
And Panchayat Raj Department, Fort
St.George Secretariat Chennai 09

2.The Commissioner Of Rural

Development And
Panchayat Raj, Directorate Of Rural
Development And Panchayat Raj,
Panagal Building Chennai 15

3.The District Collector

Nagapattinam District Nagapattinam

4.The Project Director

Rural Development And Panchayat Raj,
Nagapattinam Nagapattinam District

5.The Commissioner

Vedaranyam Panchayat Union,
Vedaranyam Nagapattinam District



WEB COPY

WP No. 40659 of 2



G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN J.
shr

WP No. 40659 of 2025
and
WMP.No.45585 of 2025

29-10-2025