



W.P.No.1724 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.1724 of 2024

G.Mahendran

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Government of Tamilnadu,
Represented by its Secretary,
Revenue Department,
Fort.St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector,
Thiruvarur District.
- 3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Kudavasal,
Thiruvarur District.
- 4.The Thasildar,
Kudavasal Taluk,
Thiruvarur District.
- 5.The District Employment Officer,
District Employment Office,
Thiruvarur,
Thiruvarur District.

6.Dhandapani

... Respondents

Prayer:

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to



W.P.No.1724 of 2024

issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records relating to the proceedings dated 25.01.2023 passed by the fourth respondent herein in Na.Ka.No.1010/2022/A4, quash the same and direct the respondents herein to appoint the petitioner herein as Village Assistant in any of the villages under Kuduvasal Taluk, Thiruvarur District.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Senthilnathan

For Respondents : Mr.R.U.Dinesh Raj Kumar for R1 to R5
Additional Government Pleader
R6 – No Appearance

O R D E R

The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records relating to the proceedings dated 25.01.2023 passed by the fourth respondent in Na.Ka.No.1010/2022/A4, quash the same and direct the respondents to appoint the petitioner as Village Assistant in any of the villages under Kuduvasal Taluk, Thiruvarur District.

2.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner belong to Schedule Caste and has passed IX Standard and registered with the Employment Exchange and the fifth respondent sponsored the list of eligible candidates for appointment to



W.P.No.1724 of 2024

the post of Village Assistant vide proceedings dated 28.10.2022 to the fourth respondent and the petitioner's name was found in serial no.4, G.T.General Non – Priority – 3 category and the petitioner appeared for the written examination for the post of Village Assistant and secured 29 marks out of 30 marks and also participated in the oral interview, however, the petitioner was not selected to the said post. The learned counsel further submitted that Employment Exchange did not sponsor the name of the sixth respondent, however, the sixth respondent was selected and further submitted that when a person is sponsored by the Employment Exchange, that person has to be given priority, however, without any sponsor from the Employment Exchange the sixth respondent was selected, which is not sustainable one.

3.The learned Additional Government Pleader submitted that as per G.O.(Ms.) No.375, Revenue [Ser8(1)] Department, dated 19.10.2015, appointment to any public post shall be made by direct recruitment after calling for applications through advertisement in newspapers apart from calling for list from the Employment Exchange after the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in 2011 (3) SCC



W.P.No.1724 of 2024

436 [State of Orissa Vs. Mamata Mohanty]. He further submitted that in the present case, apart from Employment Exchange list, there was public notice through which the sixth respondent participated and secured higher marks than the petitioner and the Rule of Reservation was also followed in the present case.

4. Heard both side and perused the materials available on record.

5. The petitioner belong to Schedule Caste and has passed IX Standard and registered with the Employment Exchange and the fifth respondent sponsored the list of eligible candidates for appointment to the post of Village Assistant vide proceedings dated 28.10.2022 to the fourth respondent and the petitioner's name was found in serial no.4, G.T. General Non – Priority – 3 category and the petitioner appeared for the written examination for the post of Village Assistant and secured 29 marks out of 30 marks and also participated in the oral interview, however, the petitioner was not selected to the said post. The grievance of the petitioner is that the Employment Exchange did not sponsor the name of the sixth respondent, however, the sixth



W.P.No.1724 of 2024

respondent was selected and that when a person is sponsored by the Employment Exchange, the said person has to be given priority.

6.As per G.O.(Ms.) No.375, Revenue [Ser8(1)] Department, dated 19.10.2015, appointment to any public post shall be made by direct recruitment after calling for applications through advertisement in newspapers apart from calling for list from the Employment Exchange after the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in 2011 (3) SCC 436 [State of Orissa Vs. Mamata Mohanty]. In the present case, apart from Employment Exchange list, there was public notice through which the sixth respondent participated and secured higher marks than the petitioner and the Rule of Reservation was also followed in the present case. Hence, the impugned order warrants no interference.

7.The writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

06.01.2026

pri

Index: Yes/ No
Speaking Order: Yes/ No
NCC: Yes/ No

5/6



WEB COPY



W.P.No.1724 of 2024

M.DHANDAPANI,J.
pri

To

- 1.The Secretary,
Revenue Department,
Fort.St.George,
Chennai – 600 009.
- 2.The District Collector,
Thiruvarur District.
- 3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Kudavasal,
Thiruvarur District.
- 4.The Thasildar,
Kudavasal Taluk,
Thiruvarur District.
- 5.The District Employment Officer,
District Employment Office,
Thiruvarur,
Thiruvarur District.

W.P.No.1724 of 2024

06.01.2026