

R.Dhinakaran Vs The State

R.Dhinakaran Vs The State

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1416432

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Jan-02-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr Justice S. M. Subramaniam, Honourable Mr. Justice C. Kumarappan

Appeal No. : WA/1662/2021

Appellant : R.Dhinakaran

Respondent : The State

Judgement :

2026:MHC:104

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM AND THE
HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN W.A.No.1662 of 2021
and C.M.P.No.10478 of 2021

1. R.Dhinakaran

2. M.S.Manikandan
3. M.Punithavalli
4. K.Anbalagan
5. G.Jeevanandam
6. R.Ramkumar
7. R.Dhinakaran
8. T.Manikandan
9. A.Munusamy
10. K.Kavitha
11. N.Pradeep Babu
12. C.Pugazhendhi
13. M.Prabhu
14. V.Vijayakumar
15. K.Vijayalakshmi
16. K.Gouse
17. K.Sangavai
18. M.Natarajan
19. N.Jayanthi
20. M.Sundari
21. T.S.Subalakshmi

22. M.Ramesh

23. T.Savarimuthu

24. K.Mahalakshmi

25. K.Hariram

26. D.Sridhar

27. R.Megala

28. Umadevi

29. D.Prabhu ... Appellants -vs-

1. The State, Rep by its Principal Secretary, St.George Fort, Chennai.

2. The Director, Panagal Building, Saidapet, Chennai.

3. The District Collector, Tiruvannamalai.

4. C.Lakshmi

5. C.Jeeva

6. K.Chitra

7. S.Kavitha

8. R.Indiragandhi

9. V.Jayanthi

10. K.Mahalakshmi

11. P.Kawsan

12. M.Saravanan

13. G.Parameshwari
14. P.Jayalakshmi
15. N.Sasikala
16. M.Sudha
17. S.Vadivel
18. M.Rani
19. R.Vani
20. T.Nethra
21. R.Vasanthi
22. P.Neelaveni
23. M.Rajeshwari
24. K.Swarnalatha
25. M.Narmatha
26. E.Jeya
27. P.Vasugi
28. C.Geetha
29. S.Sudha
30. B.Rajagandhan
31. M.M.Shanmugam
32. B.Radhakrishnan

33. P.K.Murugan

34. A.Natarajan

35. T.Valarmathi

36. R.Natesan

37. S.Rajendiran

38. A.Sankarasanmugam

39. M.Jothilakshmi

40. E.Manibalan

41. A.Veeraragavan

42. B.Balakrishnan

43. E.Parasuraman

44. T.Annamalai

45. S.Selvi

46. K.Subburayan

47. K. Sivanantham ... Respondents Prayer: Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent to set aside the order made in W.P.No.14164 of 2020 dated 06.10.2020.

For Appellants: Ms.T.Srivadivu For Mr.P.Manojkumar For R1 to R3 Dr.S.Suriya Addl. Govt. Pleader For R4 to 21, 23 to No Appearance 30, 32 to 35, 38 to 40, 42, 43, 45 & 46 For R22, 31, 36, Not Ready in Notice 37, 41 & 44 For R47 Died - Steps Due *****

JUDGMENT

(By S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.,) Under assail is the Writ Order dated 06.10.2020 passed in W.P.No.14164 of 2020. Writ Petitioners are the appellants before this Court. Writ Petition came to be instituted, challenging the panel of the year 2012 for promotion to the post of Assistant and consequently, fix the seniority and give promotion.

2. Writ Court primarily found that the writ is not entertainable

on the ground of laches. The findings of the Writ Court would show the vacancy position between the Direct Recruits and Promotees in 2011-2012 and thereafter, it has been raised as an issue by the writ petitioners before the Writ Court. Certain violations have been pointed out regarding rotation of vacancies. Finally, the seniority list published as on 01.01.2013 was raised as a cause for institution of writ proceedings. Writ Petition came to be instituted in the year 2020 after a lapse of about seven years.

3. Writ Court found that several vacancies arose in between

and numerous employees have been promoted and their seniority position has been settled. In the event of reopening the settled seniority, it will result in opening of Pandora Box and several such other similarly placed employees would also seek revision of their seniority and consequential promotions. Thus, the Writ Court rejected the writ petition on ground of laches. Settled seniority cannot be unsettled after several years. An aggrieved Government employee has to approach the competent authority within the time frame stipulated in the Service Rules and before the Court within a reasonable period of time. Once the seniority position has been settled and several persons have been promoted to the Higher Post, thereafter Courts may not entertain writ petitions for adjudication on merits, which would cause prejudice to numerous employees, who could have been promoted during the interregnum period. Thus, the rejection of the writ petition on the ground of laches cannot be construed as infirm and thus, the order of the Writ Court stands confirmed. Consequently, the Writ Appeal is dismissed. No costs. Connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed. (S.M.S,J.,) (C.K,J.,) 02.01.2026
Index: Yes Internet: Yes ar To:

1. The Principal Secretary, St.George Fort, Chennai.
2. The Director, Panagal Building, Saidapet, Chennai.
3. The District Collector, Tiruvannamalai.

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.

AND

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

ar 02.01.2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com