



W.A(MD) No.1302 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 23.06.2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

W.A(MD) No.1302 of 2025

A.Ganesapandy @ Ganesan

... Appellant / Petitioner

Vs.

**1.The Chief Secretary,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board (TANGEDCO),
144, Anna Salai,
Chennai-600 002.**

**2.The Superintending Engineer / Division,
The Management of Electricity Board (TANGEDCO),
Tirunelveli-627 011.**

**3.The Superintending Engineer / Division,
The Management of Electricity Board,
(TANGEDCO),
Central Office,
Tuticorin-628 004.**

... Respondents / Respondents



W.A(MD) No.1302 of 2025

PRAYER: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent, praying this Court to allow the writ appeal by setting aside the order passed by the learned Judge in W.P.(MD)No.24151 of 2023, dated 17.12.2024 and allow the relief sought for in the said writ petition.

For Appellant : Mr.K.Gandhiammal

For Respondents : Mr.Anand Gopalan
for M/s.Advit Law Chamber

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.**)

Heard the learned counsel for the appellant and the learned standing counsel for TANGEDCO.

2. This appeal is directed against the order dated 17.12.2024 dismissing W.P.(MD)No.24151 of 2023 filed by the appellant herein. The appellant herein filed the said writ petition for directing TANGEDCO to regularize his services on the basis of the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Justice V.Khalid Commission. The claim of the appellant is that he had worked as a contract labour during the period between 1987 to 1997. Even if we assume that the writ petitioner's claim is correct, still relief cannot be granted.



W.A(MD) No.1302 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. The learned Standing Counsel for TANGEDCO points out that the Khalid Commission gave its report in the year 1991 and the process of absorbing the persons identified by the Khalid Commission concluded on 15.02.1999. In fact, during this period, no fresh recruitment took place. Persons who felt aggrieved by their exclusion raised industrial disputes. The writ petitioner does not appear to have lodged his claim before the Khalid Commission. In any event, he cannot revive a stale claim by giving a representation a quarter century after the entire process was completed. The learned single Judge non-suited the appellant herein primarily on the ground of laches. Even according to the appellant, he was aged about 56 years in the year 2023. There is no ground to interfere with the order passed by the learned single Judge in dismissing the writ petition.

4. The Writ Appeal is dismissed. No costs.

(G.R.S., J.) (K.R.S., J.)
23.06.2025

rmi
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
NCC : Yes / No
rmi

3/4



WEB COPY



W.A(MD) No.1302 of 2025

G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.

AND

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

rmi

W.A(MD) No.1302 of 2025

23.06.2025