



W.P.No.11201 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24.03.2026

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI,
CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

WP No.11201 of 2026

Karimishetty Sreenivasulu,
S/o.K.Chinna Venkata Pullaiah,
R/o.6-38 Raja Street, Owk,
Kurnool Town, Andhra Pradesh.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Rep. by the Principal Secretary,
Fort St. George, Chennai.
2. The Union of India,
Rep. by Secretary,
Ministry of Road Transport and Highways MoRTH)
New Delhi
3. The District Collector
Chennai District, Rajaji Salai, George Town,
Chennai-600 001
4. The Director
Directorate of Social Welfare,
Panagal Maligai, 2nd Floor, Saidapet,
Chennai-600 015.



W.P.No.11201 of 2026

5. The Additional Secretary to Government,
Department of Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
6. The Commissioner
Department of Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare,
Chepauk, Chennai-600 005.
7. The Superintending Engineer
Regional Office, Ministry of Roads Transport and
Highways Regional Office, MoRTH,
C-1-A, Rajaji Bhavan, Besant Nagar, Chennai.
8. The District Collector
Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh.
9. B.Krishna Raj alias R.Thulasi Ramaprasad Singh,
S/o.Sathya Narayan Singh, Occupation Engineer,
Regional Office, MoRTH, C-1-A, Rajaji Bavan,
Besant Nagar, Chennai.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus directing the 7th respondent to strictly act upon the official communication issued by the 5th respondent vide Letter No.E-3423/CV-1/2025-1, dated 21.08.2025.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. S.V.Ruthvik
(through Video Conferencing)
For Ms. G.Malarvizhi

For Respondent(s): Mr. K.Karthik Jagannath
Government Advocate
for R1, R3 to R6

Dr.S.Padma



W.P.No.11201 of 2026

Central Government
Senior Panel Counsel
for R2

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by the Hon'ble Chief Justice)

By way of this writ petition, styled as a public interest litigation, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner seeks issuance of a mandamus to direct the seventh respondent to strictly act upon the official communication issued by the 5th respondent vide Letter No.E-3423/CV-1/2025-1, dated 21.08.2025.

2. The case of the petitioner is that though the ninth respondent secured employment claiming that he belongs to Scheduled Caste community, he belongs to Backward Class community. In this regard, the petitioner sent representations to various authorities and the fifth respondent, vide letter dated 21.8.2025 addressed to the seventh respondent, forwarded the complaint of the petitioner for taking necessary action. Alleging that the seventh respondent has not taken any action, the present writ petition is filed.



W.P.No.11201 of 2026

3. In effect, the claim of the petitioner is that the ninth respondent is continuing in service for over 25 years based on the community certificate obtained by him certifying that he belongs to Scheduled Caste community.

4. On considering the plea raised in this petition, we find that the cause of action involved pertains to service matter. It is trite that in service matters, a public interest litigation does not lie. The said view of ours is fortified by a decision of the Supreme Court in *Ashok Kumar Pandey v. State of W.B.*¹, wherein it was observed as under:

*"16. As noted supra, a time has come to weed out the petitions, which though titled as public interest litigations are in essence something else. It is shocking to note that courts are flooded with a large number of so-called public interest litigations where even a minuscule percentage can legitimately be called public interest litigations. Though the parameters of public interest litigation have been indicated by this Court in a large number of cases, yet unmindful of the real intentions and objectives, courts are entertaining such petitions and wasting valuable judicial time which, as noted above, could be otherwise utilized for disposal of genuine cases. **Though in Duryodhan Sahu (Dr.) v.***

¹ (2004) 3 SCC 349



Jitendra Kumar Mishra, (1998) 7 SCC 273, this Court held that in service matters PILs should not be entertained, the inflow of so-called PILs involving service matters continues unabated in the courts and strangely are entertained. The least the High Courts could do is to throw them out on the basis of the said decision. The other interesting aspect is that in the PILs, official documents are being annexed without even indicating as to how the petitioner came to possess them. In one case, it was noticed that an interesting answer was given as to its possession. It was stated that a packet was lying on the road and when out of curiosity the petitioner opened it, he found copies of the official documents. Whenever such frivolous pleas are taken to explain possession, the courts should do well not only to dismiss the petitions but also to impose exemplary costs. It would be desirable for the courts to filter out the frivolous petitions and dismiss them with costs as aforesaid so that the message goes in the right direction that petitions filed with oblique motive do not have the approval of the courts."

[emphasis supplied]

5. In *Hari Bansh Lal v. Sahodar Prasad Mahto and others*², the Apex Court, after referring to various earlier decisions, held as under:

² (2010) 9 SCC 655



WEB COPY



W.P.No.11201 of 2026

"15. The above principles make it clear that except for a writ of quo warranto, public interest litigation is not maintainable in service matters."

[emphasis supplied]

6. In view of the law enunciated by the Supreme Court in the aforesaid decision, the present public interest litigation is not maintainable.

Writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI,CJ) (G.ARUL MURUGAN,J)
24.03.2026

Index : Yes
Neutral Citation : Yes
sasi



W.P.No.11201 of 2026

To:

1. The Principal Secretary,
State of Tamil Nadu,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai.
2. The Secretary, Union of India,
Ministry of Road Transport and Highways (MoRTH)
New Delhi
3. The District Collector
Chennai District, Rajaji Salai, George Town,
Chennai-600 001
4. The Director
Directorate of Social Welfare,
Panagal Maligai, 2nd Floor, Saidapet,
Chennai-600 015.
5. The Additional Secretary to Government,
Department of Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare
Secretariat, Chennai-600 009.
6. The Commissioner
Department of Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare,
Chepauk, Chennai-600 005.
7. The Superintending Engineer
Regional Office, Ministry of Roads Transport and
Highways Regional Office, MoRTH,
C-1-A, Rajaji Bhavan, Besant Nagar, Chennai.
8. The District Collector
Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.11201 of 2026

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
G.ARUL MURUGAN,J.

(sasi)

WP No.11201 of 2026

24.03.2026