



W.P.No.31963 of 2017

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR

W.P.No.31963 of 2017

and WMP.Nos.35113 & 35114 of 2017

K.N.Varatharajan

...Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Collector
Kancheepuram District
Collectorate
Kancheepuram.

2.The District Revenue Officer
Kancheepuram.

3.M.Natarajan

...Respondents

Prayer: This Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the first respondent pertaining to the proceedings in Rc.A.3/18224/2017 dated 15.11.2017 & quash the same and consequently direct the respondents 1 & 2 to appoint the petitioner as Deputy Tahsildar.



W.P.No.31963 of 2017

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Deeraj

For Respondents : Mr.P.Muthukumar
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by

Mrs.S.Anitha for R1 & R2
Special Government Pleader

Mr.K.V.Sajeevkumar for R3

ORDER

The present Writ Petition has been filed assailing the order dated 15.11.2017 bearing Rc.A.3/18224/2017 passed by the first respondent. By the said order, the name of the third respondent was included in the panel for the year 2017 for promotion to the post of Deputy Tahsildar.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that, though he is senior to the third respondent, his name has not been included in the panel, whereas the name of the third respondent has been included, which, according to the petitioner, is arbitrary, discriminatory, and violative of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India.

3. The third respondent has filed a counter affidavit stating that he was appointed as Assistant on 08.05.2012, whereas the petitioner was promoted to the posts of Assistant and Firka Revenue Inspector only on 05.09.2014.

2/5



W.P.No.31963 of 2017

WEB COPY

4. The petitioner submitted a representation to the first respondent. Thereafter, the petitioner filed writ petitions in W.P.Nos.30037 of 2017 and 32573 of 2017 seeking a direction to the first respondent to consider the said representation.

5. Pursuant to the orders passed by this Court, the first respondent, vide order dated 29.12.2017, rejected the representation on the ground that the petitioner had not completed two years of service as Assistant and Firka Revenue Inspector. The said order has not been challenged by the petitioner. It is stated that the order was not communicated to him. Since the third respondent is senior to the petitioner, the petitioner cannot lay a challenge to the promotion of the third respondent to the post of Deputy Tahsildar. However, the petitioner's claim for promotion to the post of Deputy Tahsildar for the panel year 2017 has been rejected on the ground that he had not completed the requisite two years of service. It is open to the petitioner to challenge the said order by filing a fresh petition in accordance with law.



W.P.No.31963 of 2017

WEB COPY

6. With the above observations, this Writ Petition stands disposed of, preserving liberty to the petitioner to challenge the order dated 29.12.2017 issued by the first respondent. All the contentions of the parties are left open. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

03.02.2026

Index : Yes/No
Speaking order : Yes/No
dna

To

1.The District Collector
Kancheepuram District
Collectorate
Kancheepuram.

2.The District Revenue Officer
Kancheepuram.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.31963 of 2017

HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR.J.,

dna

W.P.No.31963 of 2017

and WMP.Nos.35113 & 35114 of 2017

03.02.2026