



W.P.(MD)No.17506 of 2014

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 23.03.2026

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MS.JUSTICE R.POORNIMA**

W.P.(MD)No.17506 of 2014

T.G.R. Ravisekar

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Chief Personnel Officer,
Rep. by Union of India,
Southern Railway,
Perambur, Chennai.

2.The Works Shop Personnel Officer,
Central Workshops & Stores,
Southern Railway, Ponmalai,
Trichy - 4.

3.G.Malligarjunan

4.N.Vairavan

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench in O.A.No.1487 of 2011, dated 03.12.2013 and quash the same and consequently direct the 1st and 2nd respondents to promote the petitioner



W.P.(MD)No.17506 of 2014

as Senior Technician with effect from 07.10.2010 on par with the respondents 3 and 4 and grant all consequential monetary benefits within the time stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Ms.Zubeitha Banu,
For Mr.T.A.Punithan.

For Respondents : Mr.K.R.Laxman for R1 & R2.
Mr.G.Malligarjunan for R3
Mr.N.Vairavan for R4

ORDER

(Order of the Court was delivered by G.R.Swaminathan, J.)

The writ petitioner herein joined Southern Railways as Khalasi on 28.05.1981. He was promoted as a Technician Grade-I on 05.04.1994. The combined seniority list was issued on 01.04.2002. The grievance of the writ petitioner was that his seniority was not properly assigned. Challenging the same and the subsequent denial of promotion, the writ petitioner filed O.A No.1487 of 2011 before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Madras Bench. The Tribunal vide order dated 03.12.2013 dismissed the OA. Assailing the same, this writ petition has been filed.

2.It is seen that even before the dismissal of the OA, the petitioner



W.P.(MD)No.17506 of 2014

herein had retired from service on 30.06.2012. The Tribunal had declined to grant relief to the petitioner only for the reason that the challenge to the revision of seniority was mounted after a lapse of almost ten years. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the decision reported in **(1975) 1 SCC 152 (P.S. Sadasivaswamy v. State of Tamil Nadu)** had held that when an employee is aggrieved by the assignment of his seniority, he must question the same within a period of six months. Certainly, mounting a challenge after a gap of ten years is liable to be termed as "belated". Such belated challenges are invariably repelled. The reason is obvious. Based on the seniority list, promotions would have taken place in the meanwhile. Settled matters cannot be allowed to be unsettled. "Law will aid the vigilant and not those who sleep over their rights" is a well known legal maxim. The Tribunal rightly dismissed the OA. We do not find any ground to interfere with the order of the Tribunal. The writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

(G.R.S. J.) & (R.P. J.)
23.03.2026

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes/ No

3/5



W.P.(MD)No.17506 of 2014

ias

WEB COPY



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.17506 of 2014

G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.
and
R.POORNIMA, J.

ias

W.P.(MD)No.17506 of 2014

23.03.2026