



WEB COPY

WP No. 21473 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-02-2026

CORAM

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

WP No. 21473 of 2025

S.Gururajan

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Director

Information And Public Relations Officiating
Joint Secretaryn To Government Secretariat
9th Floor For St George, Rajaji Salai, Chennai.

2. District Collector

District Collectorate, Grand Southern Trunk
Road, Chengapatu Venbakam,

3. District Collector

District Collectorate, State Bank Road
Coimbator Ecentral, Coimbatore 641 018.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer:- Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a writ of Mandamus, calling for records relating to the impugned order vide letter no. 409/Se. VA /2023 dated 01.08.2023 passed by the 1st respondent quash the same and to consequently direct the 1st respondent to sanction pension to petitioner under the Tamil Nadu journalist pension scheme.



WEB COPY

WP No. 21473 of 2



For Petitioner(s):

Mr.R.Arvind

For Respondent(s):

Mr.Yogesh Kannadasan, SGP

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed for the following reliefs:-

“calling for records relating to the impugned order vide letter no. 409/Se. VA /2023 dated 01.08.2023 passed by the 1st respondent quash the same and to consequently direct the 1st respondent to sanction pension to petitioner under the Tamil Nadu journalist pension scheme.”

2. Brief Facts:-

3. The petitioner would submit that the Tamil Nadu Journalists' Pension Scheme, which was introduced on 14.04.1989, provides financial assistance to retired journalists from economically weaker sections in recognition of their service. The eligibility criteria under the said Scheme, including income and gratuity ceilings, have been revised from time to time. By virtue of G.O.Ms.No.133 dated 24.05.2012, the gratuity ceiling was enhanced from Rs.2,00,000/- to Rs.3,00,000/- and the income limits were also revised.

4. The petitioner would submit that he had retired as a Senior Reporter from The New Indian Express, Coimbatore, in March 2003, with a last drawn



salary of Rs.9,970/- per month and received a gratuity of Rs.1,36,000/-. On 01.12.2014 the petitioner had applied for pension under the above said Scheme before the 1st respondent. Thereafter, the 3rd respondent had verified the petitioner's credentials and recommended his case. The 2nd respondent by communication dated 27.12.2022 also recommended the petitioner's application for sanction of pension under G.O.Ms. No.133 dated 24.05.2012. However, the 1st respondent, by the impugned order dated 05.07.2023, had rejected the petitioner's application on the ground that the petitioner's salary and gratuity exceeded the prescribed limits as set out in G.O. Ms. No. 151 dated 11.07.2000. Challenging the same, the petitioner is approached this Court.

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

6. The petitioner seeks grant of pension in terms of G.O.Ms. No.133 dated 24.05.2012, which claim came to be rejected by the 1st Respondent vide order dated 05.07.2023 on the ground that the petitioner's salary and gratuity exceeded the prescribed limits as set out in G.O. Ms. No. 151 dated 11.07.2000. It is an admitted fact that the petitioner had retired on 31.03.2003. At the relevant point in time, the applicable pension scheme was governed by G.O.Ms. No.151 dated 11.07.2000, under which the petitioner has already availed the benefits.



7. The contention of the petitioner that he ought to be treated on par with one Mr.V. Sreenivasan is not sustainable. The said Mr.V. Sreenivasan was granted pension under G.O.Ms. No.74 dated 29.04.2025 only as a special case, taking into consideration that he was a differently-abled person and based on specific recommendations made in that regard. Further, G.O.Ms. No.74 dated 29.04.2025 issued in favour of the above-said individual categorically states that the benefit extended therein is a special concession and shall not be treated as a precedent.

8. The petitioner, having retired in the year 2003, cannot seek to claim the benefit of a Government Order issued nearly nine years thereafter. Such a claim is not sustainable. Further, though the learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is in indigent circumstances, no such averment has been made in the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition, nor have any supporting documents been placed on record to substantiate the same.

9. In view of the above discussions, this Court finds no merit in the Writ Petition and the same is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

11-02-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

SHR



To

1. The Director
Information And Public Relations Officiating
Joint Secretary To Government Secretariat 9th
Floor For St George, Rajaji Salai, Chennai.
2. District Collector
District Collectorate, Grand Southern Trunk
Road, Chengapatu Venbakam,
3. District Collector
District Collectorate, State Bank Road
Coimbatore Ecentral, Coimbatore 641 018.



WEB COPY

WP No. 21473 of 2



P.T.ASHA, J.

SHR

WP No. 21473 of 2025

11-02-2026