



WEB COPY

WP No. 6426 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V. KARTHIKEYAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.KUMARESH BABU

WP No. 6426 of 2026

and

W.M.P.No.6958 of 2026

1. Union of India
Rep. by the Secretary,
Ministry of Communication,
Department of Posts,
Dak Bhavan, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi 110 001.
2. The Assistant Director General (DE)
Ministry of Communication,
Department of Posts,
Dak Bhavan, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi 110 001
3. The Director (DE)
Ministry of Communication,
Department of Posts,
Dak Bhavan, Sansad Marg,
New Delhi 110 001
4. The Chief Postmaster General
Tamil Nadu Circle, Anna Salai
Chennai 600 002

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

M.N .Chandrasekar
S/o. M.Narayanasamy,
Plot No. 95 west side,
Lakshmi Vilas Bank Employees colony,



Perumalpattu,
Tiruvallur district 602 024

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for records of the Hon'ble Tribunal in its impugned order dated 26.02.2024 in O.A.536/2020 passed by Hon'ble Central Administrative Tribunal, Chennai Bench and quash the same.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. M. Karthikeyan

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Malaichamy

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by K.Kumaresh Babu J.)

The present writ petition has been filed to quash the order of the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chennai Bench, in O.A.No.536 of 2020 dated 26.02.2024.

2. Heard Mr.M.Karthikeyan, learned Standing Counsel for the petitioners and Mr.R.Malaichamy, learned counsel for the respondent.

3. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the respondent was originally appointed as a Sorting Assistant in the year 2011 and is currently employed at the Computerised Registration Centre in Chennai. He had participated in the Limited Departmental Competitive Examination (LDCE) conducted for promotion to the Inspector of Posts cadre



during the year 2019. The results were finally published on 24.06.2020, but its implementation was deferred in view of discrepancies in the answers, and the matter was referred to a Review Committee.

4. He would submit that none of the candidates who were successful in the said LDCE were permitted to take up positions in any of the Circles, including the Tamil Nadu Circle, with the exception of the Odisha Circle, where all were reverted to their original cadre and the selected candidates, based upon the revised results announced on 13.11.2020 pursuant to the Review Committee's recommendations, assumed their new positions. He would submit that all the vacancies announced for the LDCE examination for the years 2016-17 to 2018 have been filled up based on the revised results that were announced, and therefore it was not feasible to accommodate any other candidates without any notified vacancies, remaining vacant or against future vacancies, as it would undermine the legitimate rights of eligible candidates both from the department and open market in recruitments for the upcoming years. Overlooking the same, the Tribunal, following a decision of the Karnataka High Court, had allowed the Original Application. Hence, he would seek the indulgence of this Court.

5. Countering his arguments, Mr. R.Malaichamy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the learned counsel for the respondent, would submit that the High Court of Karnataka, while considering a similar issue, had upheld the orders of the Tribunal, holding that it was impermissible to review the



results once published, and had also upheld the directions issued by the Tribunal for creation of supernumerary posts. He would further submit that the aforesaid judgment was taken on appeal before the Hon'ble Apex Court, and the Special Leave Petition came to be dismissed, which was followed up by a Review by the Government and the same also came to be dismissed. He has produced the judgments of the Hon'ble Apex Court in the S.L.P and the Review Petition passed in this case. Hence, he pleads this Court to dismiss the writ petition.

6. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials placed on record.

7. The Tribunal had relied upon the judgment of the Karnataka High Court made in the case of *Union of India and Ors., Vs. Vijayakumar S.Emmegol* made in *W.P.No.106050 of 2023 dated 12.10.2023* and also the decision of the Delhi High Court in the case of *Union of India & anr., Vs. Sh.Manish Kundnani & Ors.*, made in *W.P.(C) No.1565/2023 dated 05.12.2023*, and had granted the relief. The Tribunal, by applying the said judgments and held that the same are applicable to the facts of the case, had allowed the Original Application on the said principles and directed consideration of the respondent for selection in the year 2018 for the post of Inspector, if he was otherwise eligible.



8. The issue involved in this writ petition, as well as in the order of the Karnataka High Court (cited *supra*), relates to the LDCE examination that was conducted, of which results were originally published on 24.06.2020. Therefore, we are of the view that the impugned order herein, which relied upon the judgment of the Karnataka High Court, cannot be faulted. It is also to be noted that the Special Leave Petition filed against the said order came to be dismissed by the Hon'ble Apex Court by order dated 16.09.2025 and a further Review Petition filed by the Government also came to be dismissed on 10.02.2026.

9. In such view of the matter, we do not find any irregularity or infirmity, which requires interference by this Court.

10. In fine, the writ petition stands dismissed and there shall be a direction to the petitioners to issue a promotion order to the post of Inspector based upon the selection results declared on 24.06.2020, by creating a supernumerary post, if required.

11. It is made clear that the name of the respondent shall figure at the bottom of the list of selected candidates prepared on the basis of the second revised result declared on 13.11.2020. Such appointment shall relate back to the date on which the applicant ought to have been appointed, with continuity of service only for the purpose of seniority as indicated above; however, without



back wages, arrears of salary, or other incidental benefits. The order shall be implemented within a period of twelve (12) weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

12. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

(C.V.K.,J.) (K.B.,J.)
25-02-2026

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

kak

To

The Central Administrative Tribunal,
Chennai Bench.



WEB COPY

WP No. 6426 of 2



**C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.
AND
K.KUMARESH BABU, J.**

kak

WP No. 6426 of 2026

25-02-2026