



WEB COPY

WP No. 769 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20-01-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

WP No. 769 of 2026

S.Manickam
S/o.Saminathan,
No.59, Radhakrishnan Street,
Perambalur,
Perambalur District- 621 212.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep by secretary to Government,
Adi Dravidar Welfare Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009
2. The Director of
Adi Dravidar Welfare department,
Chepauk,
Chennai 600 005
3. The District Welfare officer
Adi Dravidar Welfare Department,
Perambalur,
perambalur District 621 212
4. The Special Tahsildar
Adi Dravidar Welfare Department,
Perambalur District 621 212

..Respondent(s)

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 11.11.2025 to regularize the service of the petitioner from the date of his initial appointment on 01.11.2007 with all monetary and consequential benefits and arrears.



WEB COPY

For Petitioner(s):

Ms.S.Esai Rani Narasimman

For Respondent(s):

Mr.S.Balamurugan
Government Advocate**ORDER**

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking a direction to the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 11.11.2025 to regularize the service of the petitioner from the date of his initial appointment on 01.11.2007 with all monetary and consequential benefits and arrears.

2. Mr.S.Balamurugan, learned Government Advocate takes notice on behalf of the respondents. In view of the consent expressed by the learned counsel on either side, the Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself.

3. The case of the petitioner is that he was appointed as a Cook on 01.11.2007 in the Government Students Hostel at Kolakkanatham under the Adi Dravidar Welfare Department and that his services were subsequently regularized as per G.O.Ms.No.25, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare (ADW) Department, dated 25.02.2011. He was appointed through the Employment Exchange on consolidated pay in a sanctioned post and had been continuously discharging his duties. He made several representations seeking regularization



of his service from the date of initial appointment with monetary and consequential benefits. Thereafter, he made a representation dated 11.11.2025,

requesting the authorities to regularize his service with effect from 01.11.2007.

As no orders were passed on the said representation, the present Writ Petition has been filed.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had been appointed in a sanctioned post through proper channel and had been continuously working since 01.11.2007. It was submitted that though his services were regularized subsequently, he had not been granted regularization from the date of his initial appointment along with monetary and other consequential benefits. The learned counsel relied upon the orders passed by this Court in W.P.No.6737 of 2023 dated 04.03.2024, wherein similarly placed persons were granted directions for consideration of regularization in the light of the Full Bench judgment. Therefore, the learned counsel prayed for regularization of the petitioner's service with effect from 01.11.2007 with all monetary benefits.

5. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents submitted that the petitioner had been appointed only on consolidated pay and that his services had already been regularized in accordance with G.O.Ms.No.25, dated 25.02.2011. It was further submitted that the petitioner



had made a representation seeking retrospective regularization from the date of his initial appointment after a lapse of nearly 14 years. Such belated claim was not maintainable and was liable to be rejected on the ground of delay and laches. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of the Writ Petition.

6. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the material available on record.

7. It is not in dispute that the petitioner was appointed on 01.11.2007 and that his services were regularized subsequently as per the relevant Government Order. The petitioner sought retrospective regularization from the date of his initial appointment by making a representation only in the year 2025, after a lapse of about 14 years. It is seen that compassionate or retrospective service benefits cannot be claimed as a matter of right after an inordinate delay. In the present case, the claim is clearly hit by delay and laches. In such circumstances, this Court finds no grounds to interfere.

8. Accordingly, this Writ Petition stands dismissed. No Costs.

20-01-2026

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



WEB COPY

To

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep by secretary to Government,
Adi Dravidar Welfare Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009
2. The Director of
Adi Dravidar Welfare department,
Chepauk,
Chennai 600 005
3. The District Welfare officer
Adi dravidar Welfare Department,
Perambalur,
perambalur District 621 212
4. The Special Tahsildar
Adi Dravidar Welfare Department,
Perambalur District 621 212



WEB COPY

WP No. 769 of 2



M.DHANDAPANI, J.

ANU

WP No. 769 of 2026

20-01-2026