



W.A.(MD)No.1917 of 2021

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 09.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE R.KALAIMATHI

W.A(MD)No.1917 of 2021

Muthu Pandi

... Appellant /
Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Collector,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.

2.The District Employment Officer,
Department of Employment and Training,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli – 627 004.

3.The Tahsildar,
Sankarankovil Taluk,
Sankarankovil,
Tirunelveli District.

4.Selvarani
5.Swamydass

... Respondents /
Respondents

Prayer: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent to set aside the order passed in W.P(MD)No.9038 of 2014 dated 04.11.2020 and allow the Writ Appeal.



W.A.(MD)No.1917 of 2021

For Appellant : Mr.A.Robinson

For Respondents : Mr.A.Baskaran
Additional Government Pleader
for R.1 to R.3

Mr.A.John Vincent
for R.4 & R.5

JUDGMENT

(Judgment of the Court was made by G.R.Swaminathan J.)

Heard both sides.

2.The unsuccessful writ petitioner is the appellant before us. The appellant was an aspirant for the post of Village Assistant. Recruitment for the post of Village Assistant in Vellapaneri and Moovirandali villages in Sankarankovil Taluk was held in the year 2013. The writ petitioner is aggrieved by the appointment of the respondents 4 and 5 to the said post. Challenging their appointment, the appellant filed W.P(MD)No.9038 of 2014. The learned single Judge vide order dated 04.11.2020 dismissed the writ petition in the following terms:

“2.The grievances of the writ petitioner is that the persons, who were not belonging to the notified village were appointed. Admittedly, the village, in which, the petitioner is residing, namely, Vanniconenthel, had not been notified in the recruitment notification. The name of



W.A.(MD)No.1917 of 2021

the writ petitioner was not sponsored by the Employment Exchange, in view of the fact that he is not residing in the village notified, as per the recruitment notification. The recruitment notification reveals that the village of Vadakku Panavadali Chatram is notified. The respondents 4 and 5 are residing in Vadakku Panavadali Chatram and therefore, the contention of the writ petitioner is that the appointed candidates are residing outside the notified village, is incorrect. This apart, the name of the writ petitioner was not even sponsored by the Employment Exchange as he had not sponsored the recruitment conditions.

3.This being the factum, now after this length of time, the appointed candidates cannot be disturbed and further, the writ petitioner has not established any acceptable legal ground for the purpose of granting the relief as such sought for.”

Challenging the same, this Writ Appeal has been filed.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the appellant reiterated all the contentions set out in the grounds of appeal. He pointed out that, while it is true that the writ petitioner was not a resident of the villages in question, the selected candidates were also not residents of the villages in question. He would contend that, compared to their places of residence, the appellant resided closer to the villages in question. He called upon



W.A.(MD)No.1917 of 2021

this Court to set aside the order impugned in the writ petition and grant relief as prayed for.

4.We are not swayed by the said submission. As rightly pointed out by the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the department and the learned counsel appearing for the selected candidates, this is second round of litigation. The petitioner had earlier filed W.P(MD)No.15466 of 2013 demanding that his name should be included in the seniority list for the purpose of appointment to the post in question. The writ petition was dismissed on 06.01.2014 on the ground that the writ petitioner's name was not sponsored on the ground that he did not reside in the village in question. Thus, the issue regarding the non-sponsoring of the writ petitioner's name for the post in question by the Employment Exchange had attained finality. The appellant did not file any appeal challenging the dismissal order dated 06.01.2014 made in W.P(MD)No.15466 of 2013. Once the appellant became ineligible, he lacks the locus standi to question the appointment of the respondents 4 and 5 herein. It is well settled that in service law, only a person aggrieved can mount a challenge. For this reason as well as the reasons assigned by the learned single Judge, we decline to interfere.



W.A.(MD)No.1917 of 2021

5.This Writ Appeal stands dismissed. No costs.

WEB COPY

[G.R.S., J.] [R.K.M, J.]
09.12.2025

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes/ No
MGA

To

- 1.The District Collector,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli.
- 2.The District Employment Officer,
Department of Employment and Training,
Tirunelveli District,
Tirunelveli – 627 004.
- 3.The Tahsildar,
Sankarankovil Taluk,
Sankarankovil,
Tirunelveli District.



WEB COPY



W.A.(MD)No.1917 of 2021

G.R.SWAMINATHAN,J.

AND

R.KALAIMATHI, J.

MGA

W.A(MD)No.1917 of 2021

09.12.2025