



WEB COPY

WP No. 9200 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE P.T. ASHA

W.P.No.9200 of 2026

R.Ranjith
S/o.M.Ravi
3/106, Lalbagadur Shasthri Street
Ariyur, Vellore-632 055

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Chairman
Tamil Nadu Uniformed Services Recruitment
Board, Pantheon Road,
Egmore, Chennai-600 008
2. The Director General of Police
Dr.Radhakrishnan Salai
Mylapore, Chennai-600 004
3. The Superintendent of Police
Vellore District
Vellore

..Respondent(s)

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of certiorarified mandamus to call for the records of the third respondent in Na.Ka.No.A3/015033/557/2022 dated 28.05.2023 and quash the same and direct the respondents to appoint the petitioner as a Grade II Police Constable.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.E.Prabu

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.V.Dinesh Rajkumar
Additional Government Pleader



ORDER

Challenging the order dated 28.05.2023 in Na.Ka.No.A3/015033/557/2022 passed by the third respondent cancelling the provisional selection of the petitioner to the post of Grade II Police Constable, he is before this Court.

2. The short facts, which has resulted in the filing of the writ petition are as follows:

2.1 The petitioner, who is a B.Sc., graduate, had, in the year 2022, applied for the post of Grade II Police Constable and an FIR was pending against him. However, no charge was had been filed and the matter had not even reached the Court and therefore, the petitioner *bona fide* believed that disclosure had not been required and left the relevant column blank.

2.2 Thereafter, the FIR was taken on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Vellore in S.T.C.No.21 of 2023, in which, the complainant and his father had testified. During the trial in S.T.C.No.21 of 2023, the complainant was examined as PW1 on 02.03.2023, who categorically deposed that no such incident ever took place and the police had obtained his signature in a blank paper and created the complaint. The father of the complainant, who was



examined as PW2, stated that he knew nothing about the offence and had only accompanied his son to the police station, as his son had asked him to accompany him.

2.3 Thereafter, the Judicial Magistrate, after full fledged trial, acquitted the petitioner from all the charges and discharged him from Crime No.48 of 2021. Meanwhile, the petitioner had completed the written test and physical efficiency test and was provisionally selected for appointment to the post of Grade II Police Constable by notification dated 29.03.2023 and the petitioner's name was selected in the provisional list in Enrolment No.2110904.

2.4 However, to the utter shock and surprise of the petitioner, in the first week of June 2023, he received the impugned order dated 28.05.2023 passed by the third respondent cancelling his provisional selection on the ground that he had failed to disclose the FIR in Crime No.48 of 2021. Challenging the same, the petitioner is before this Court.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner had pressed into service the order of this Court in W.P.No.32817 of 2017 to contend that, in such cases, the Court must take more liberal view and not debar the candidates, who are otherwise qualified, on mere technicalities. The learned Judge had opined that the episode, which has led to the filling of the criminal case, itself appears



to have been an accident of youth and therefore, the same should not be permitted to cast a shadow over their career and prospects in life.

WEB COPY

4. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the records.

5. The petitioner had submitted his application for common recruitment for the year 2022, in which, against the column, “*whether any criminal case have been filed against you*”, the petitioner has stated “No”. In the affidavit, the petitioner would state that he had left this column blank. Further, the complaint against the petitioner is for criminal intimidation and wrongful confinement and the acquittal of the petitioner was on the ground of benefit of doubt.

6. It is pertinent to state that Rule 13 of the Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Police Subordinate Service sets out the qualifications for appointment to the service by direct recruitment.

7. Rule 13 (e) of the Special Rules for Tamil Nadu Police Subordinate Service reads as follows:

“Rule 13. Qualifications.—

.....

(e) that he has not involved in any criminal case before Police verification.”



The explanation (1) therein would read as follows:

“Explanation (1).—A person who is acquitted or discharged on the benefit of doubt or due to the fact that the complainant turned hostile, shall be treated as a person involved in a criminal case.”

8. Therefore, in light of the aforesaid explanation and the fact that the petitioner has been acquitted on the ground of benefit of doubt, since the complainant had turned hostile, it has to be treated that at the time of police verification, he has been involved in a criminal case. The petitioner has suppressed this fact in the application and has stated that there was no criminal case against him, whereas, at the relevant point of time, a criminal case was pending against him in the form of an FIR.

9. In such view of the matter, I see no reason much less any reason to interfere with the order dated 28.05.2023 passed in Na.Ka.No.A3/015033/557/2022 on the file of the third respondent cancelling the provisional selection of the petitioner to the post of Grade II Police Constable.

In the result, this writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

09-03-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
nsd



To

1. The Chairman
Tamil Nadu Uniformed services Recruitment
Board
Pantheon Road,
Egmore,
Chennai-600 008
2. The Director General of Police
Dr.Radhakrishnan salai
Mylapore
Chennai-600 004
3. The Superintendent of police
Vellore District
Vellore



WEB COPY

WP No. 9200 of 2



P.T.ASHA J.

nsd

WP No. 9200 of 2026

09-03-2026