



WEB COPY

WP No. 1522 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23-01-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

**WP No. 1522 of 2026
and W.M.P.No.1635 of 2026**

M.Selvi

Vs

..Petitioner(s)

1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep.by Secretary,
Department of Revenue and Disaster Management,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-09.

2.The District Collector,
Office of the District Collector,
Villupuram.

3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Gingee Taluk,
Villupuram District.

4.The Tahsildar,
Gingee Taluk,
Villupuram District.

5.The Block Development Officer,
Gingee Taluk,
Villupuram District.

6.The Chairman,
Gingee Panchayat Union,
Villupuram District.



7.The Commissioner,
Gingee Panchayat Union,
Villupuram District.

WEB COPY

..Respondent(s)

Prayer : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the 4th respondent in his proceedings in Na.Ka.A3/599/2025 dated 29.11.2025 and quash the same and consequently direct the Respondents 4 and 5 to appoint the Petitioner as Village Assistant.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.P.Dinesh Kumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.M.Rajendiran,
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the order dated 29.11.2025 passed by the 4th respondent, whereby the petitioner's request for appointment to the post of Village assistant has been rejected.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that the subject land belonging to the petitioner, measuring to an extent of 9 cents, was taken over by the Government for the purpose of constructing a Public Road between Perungappur-Manalappadi Road. According to the petitioner, the land was handed over to the officials on the assurance given by them that one member of her family would be provided with employment, however, any compensation was paid to her nor



any appointment order was issued and therefore, the petitioner submitted a representation to the respondents seeking appointment to the post of Village Assistant. However, the said representation was rejected vide impugned order dated 29.11.2025 on the ground that, as on date, there is no vacancy to the said post. Aggrieved by the said rejection, the present Writ Petition has been filed.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that, the impugned order is wholly arbitrary and illegal as no opportunity of hearing was given to the petitioner before passing the same rejecting her claim, which is in violation of principles of natural justice and that no compensation was paid to the petitioner, nor any employment was provided thereby the respondents had failed to honour their promise of providing employment. Therefore, the order impugned in this Writ Petition is liable to be interfered with. Accordingly, he prayed for allowing the Writ Petition.

4. Learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents submitted that the petitioner's husband had voluntarily executed a gift deed in favour of the Government for the purpose of road formation and that there is no such undertaking given to the petitioner or her husband that she would be compensated by way of employment as stated by her, either in the gift deed or any other record to show that, it was at the request of the respondent officials, the petitioner had executed the gift deed. In the absence of any such material,



the petitioner cannot claim employment as a matter of right. He further submitted that preference for employment would be given only in cases where land acquisition affects the primary source of livelihood, whereas, in the present case, the petitioner's husband is employed as conductor and therefore, the claim of the petitioner was rightly rejected. Accordingly, he prayed for dismissal of the Writ Petition.

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

6. It is not in dispute that the petitioner's husband had executed a gift deed in respect of the subject property in favour of the Government for public purpose. It is the specific case of the petitioner that, the said land was given based on the assurance alleged to have been given by the 5th respondent that employment would be provided to one of the family members of the petitioner, however, no material has been placed by the petitioner to substantiate the same.

7. A perusal of the impugned order further reveals that the claim of the petitioner seeking employment was rejected on the ground that preference for employment would be given only to those persons whose lands were acquired and whose primary source of livelihood was affected, however, in the present case, the petitioner's husband is working as Conductor and therefore, the



question of loss of livelihood does not arise and the petitioner does not fall within the zone of consideration. Therefore, this Court finds no infirmity in the impugned order and this Writ Petition deserves to be dismissed.

8. For the reasons aforestated, the Writ Petition stands dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

23-01-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

NHS

To

1.The Secretary,
The Government of Tamil Nadu,
Department of Revenue and Disaster Management,
Fort St.George,
Chennai-09.

2.The District Collector,
Office of the District Collector,
Villupuram.

3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Gingee Taluk,
Villupuram District.

4.The Tahsildar,
Gingee Taluk,
Villupuram District.



WEB COPY

WP No. 1522 of 2



M.DHANDAPANI, J.

NHS

5.The Block Development Officer,
Gingee Taluk,
Villupuram District.

6.The Chairman,
Gingee Panchayat Union,
Villupuram District.

7.The Commissioner,
Gingee Panchayat Union,
Villupuram District.

**WP No. 1522 of 2026
and W.M.P.No.1635 of 2026**

23-01-2026