(2011) 10 MAD CK 0042

Madras High Court (Madurai Bench)

Case No: Writ Petition (MD) No. 10582 of 2011

C. Joseph Arulraj — APPELLANT

Vs

The Managing Director, Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation (Madurai) Limited, Madurai Division, (Now re-designated as Tamilnadu State Transport Corporation, Tirunelveli Limited, Tirunelveli Division), The General Manager, Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation (Madurai) Limited, Nagercoil Division, Ranithottam, Kanyakumari District. (Now re-designated as Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation, Tirunelveli Limited, Nagercoil Division, Ranithottam, Kanyakumari District) and The District Employment Officer, Kanyakumari District, Nagercoil — RESPONDENT

Date of Decision: Oct. 13, 2011

Citation: (2011) 10 MAD CK 0042

Hon'ble Judges: T. Raja, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: C.K.M. appaji, for the Appellant; M. Alagathevan, Special Govt. Pleader, for the Respondent

Final Decision: Dismissed

Judgement

@JUDGMENTTAG-ORDER

Honourable Mr. Justice T. Raja

1. The petitioner has come to this Court seeking for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus to direct the respondents to appoint him in pursuant to the interview held on 23.04.2007 in the office of the second respondent.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner was issued with an interview card on 10.04.2007, calling upon him to attend an interview held on 23.04.2007 at 8.a.m. for the post of Conductor in the Transport Corporation. On receipt of the call letter, the petitioner also attended before the second respondent on 23.04.2007 by furnishing all the testimonials such as educational certificates, conductor license and employment registration particulars in order to prove his eligibility. After scrutinizing all the documents produced by the petitioner before the second respondent, the second respondent advised him to wait for some time to know the results. Thereafter, there was no communication from the second respondent for a long time. Therefore, the petitioner approached the second respondent to know the outcome of the interview. But they were not able to tell about the status of the results. Consequently, the petitioner has come to this Court seeking the above said prayer.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that after the interview was held on 23.04.2007, the results of the interview were also declared on subsequent date.

4. If this is the status of the case of the petitioner, if at all the petitioner is aggrieved by his non-selection, the proper course open to the petitioner is to challenge only the selection of other candidates and hence, the present prayer cannot be maintained. Therefore, the present writ petition is liable to be dismissed. Accordingly, the same is dismissed. No costs.