
(2014) 07 MAD CK 0205

In the Madras High Court

Case No : Writ Petition No. 7971 of 2008

M.Sudalai

APPELLANT

Vs

The State of Tamilnadu

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 07-07-2014

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2014) 07 MAD CK 0205

Hon'ble Judges : M.M. Sundresh, J

Bench : Single Bench

Judgement

M.M. Sundresh, J.—The grievance of the petitioner is that persons junior to him have been given higher salary. With that grievance, the petitioner approached the respondents. The request of the petitioner was rejected by the proceedings dated 18.11.1988. Thereafter, the petitioner made further representations, which were also rejected by the 2nd respondent by the impugned order dated 31.12.2007. Challenging the same, the present writ petition has been filed.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that in the Store Keeper II Grade, he was senior to one D. Mohan. However, his request for revision of seniority consequent on the promotion of the said D. Mohan was rejected without any basis. In the counter affidavit it has been stated that the seniority has been fixed based upon the date of joining in the post of S.N. Helper. Based upon the workload settlement, promotions have been given to some of the employees as C.A. The seniority of the Store Keeper II Grade was canceled and appointments have been made with reference to the date of joining in the Store Keeper II Grade. Subsequently, based upon the representations received from S.N. Helpers promoted as C.A. and selected for the post of Store Keeper II Grade, the seniority of Store Keeper II Grade was revised.

3. From the above said facts, it is clear that the petitioner was not appointed as C.A. notionally. Some of his juniors were placed above him due to the appointment to the post of C.A. before the appointment to the post of Store Keeper II Grade. The request made by the petitioner was already rejected as

early as 18.11.1988. Thereafter, the petitioner pursued it once again and by the impugned order the earlier stand taken on 18.11.1988 has been confirmed.

4. In the light of the above said facts, it is clear that the petitioner has not challenged the revision made already and his request was rejected as early as 18.11.1988 and he was also not appointed as C.A. notionally like that of the others. In such view of the matter, this Court does not find any merit in he writ petition. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. However, there is no order as to costs.