

Bahour Commune Panchayat Vs Bahour Commune Panchayat

Bahour Commune Panchayat Vs Bahour Commune Panchayat

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1422973

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Feb-16-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice Hemant Chandangoudar

Appeal No. : WP/25031/2015

Appellant : Bahour Commune Panchayat

Respondent : Bahour Commune Panchayat

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 27.01.2026 Delivered on : 16.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR and
W.M.P.No.4740 of 2020, M.P.Nos.2, 2, 2 & 3 of 2015 W.P.No.25031 of
2015:

1. Bahour Commune Panchayat Employees' Union Represented by its
Secretary V.Anbarasan 49, Rodiyer Mill Road, Mudaliyarpettai,
Pondicherry - 4.

2. D.Janarthanan S/o.Devanathan ... Petitioners * P2 impleaded vide order dated 27.01.2026 made in W.M.P.No.2984 of 2026 in W.P.No.25031 of 2015 vs.

1. Bahour Commune Panchayat Represented by its Commissioner Bahour Commune Panchayat Office Bahour, Pondicherry - 607 402.

2. The Director Local Administration Department Pondicherry. Page Nos.1/29

3. The Government of Pondicherry Represented by its Secretary Department of Local Administration Chief Secretariat, Pondicherry.

4. G.Ganesan @ Manogaran C/o.Bahour Commune Panchayat Bahour Commune Panchayat Office Bahour, Pondicherry - 607 402.

5. V.Perumal C/o.Bahour Commune Panchayat Bahour Commune Panchayat Office Bahour, Pondicherry - 607 402.

6. P.Kuppammal C/o.Bahour Commune Panchayat Bahour Commune Panchayat Office Bahour, Pondicherry - 607 402.

7. R.Shanmugham C/o.Bahour Commune Panchayat Bahour Commune Panchayat Office Bahour, Pondicherry - 607 402.

8. S.Sambasivam C/o.Bahour Commune Panchayat Bahour Commune Panchayat Office Bahour, Pondicherry - 607 402.

9. K.Ramachandiran C/o.Bahour Commune Panchayat Bahour Commune Panchayat Office Bahour, Pondicherry - 607 402. Page Nos.2/29

10. A.Velou C/o.Bahour Commune Panchayat Bahour Commune Panchayat Office Bahour, Pondicherry - 607 402.

11. N.Dhanaraman C/o.Bahour Commune Panchayat Bahour Commune Panchayat Office Bahour, Pondicherry - 607 402.

12. L.Parameshwari C/o.Bahour Commune Panchayat Bahour Commune Panchayat Office Bahour, Pondicherry - 607 402.

13. T.Sarasu C/o.Ariankuppam Commune Panchayat Ariankuppam Commune Panchayat Office Pondicherry - 605 007.

14. R.Valarmathy C/o.Ariankuppam Commune Panchayat Ariankuppam Commune Panchayat Office Pondicherry - 605 007.

15. P.Candavel C/o.Ariankuppam Commune Panchayat Ariankuppam Commune Panchayat Office Pondicherry - 605 007.

16. S.Sezhian C/o.Ariankuppam Commune Panchayat Ariankuppam Commune Panchayat Office Pondicherry - 605 007. Page Nos.3/29

17. P.Kavimany

C/o.Mannadipet Commune Panchayat Mannadipet Commune Panchayat Office Pondicherry. Respondents Writ Petition No.25031 of 2015 filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records and quash the G.O.Ms.No.15/LAS/2015-16 Puducherry dated 31.07.2015 in respect of the appointments of respondents 4 to 17 and consequently, direct the respondents 1 to 3 to consider and appoint the existing daily rated employees and other regular employees of the Bahour Panchayat either by regularisation / direct recruitment / promotion in the vacancies.

W.P.No.24418 of 2015 A.Mourougayane S/o.Arjunan ... Petitioner Vs

1. Union of India By Government of Puducherry Rep. by its Chief Secretary Chief Secretariat, Goubert Avenue Puducherry - 605 001.

2. The Under Secretary to Government Local Administration Government of Puducherry Puducherry - 605 001. Page Nos.4/29
3. T.Sarasu LDC Ariyankuppam Commune Panchayat
4. R.Valarmathy LDC Ariyankuppam Commune Panchayat
5. P.Kavimany LDC Mannadipet Commune Panchayat
6. S.Sezhian LDC Ariyankuppam Commune Panchayat
7. P.Selvan LDC Mannadipet Commune Panchayat
8. J.Ramanaraj LDC Mannadipet Commune Panchayat
9. A.Arul Mozhi Devan LDC Mannadipet Commune Panchayat Page Nos.5/29
10. S.Illango LDC Villianoor Commune Panchayat
11. N.Manimegalai

LDC Thirunallar Commune Panchayat Puducherry. Respondents Writ Petition No.24418 of 2015 filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the second respondent dated 31.07.2015 in G.O.No.15/LAS/2015-16 and to quash the same and consequently, to direct the second respondent to fill up the 65 posts under various Panchayats by regular selection process.

W.P.No.24419 of 2015 S.Sinnadhu S/o.Sadagoban ... Petitioner Vs

1. Union of India By Government of Puducherry Rep. by its Chief Secretary Chief Secretariat, Goubert Avenue Puducherry - 605 001.
2. The Under Secretary to Government Local Administration Government of Puducherry Puducherry - 605 001. Page Nos.6/29

3. T.Sarasu LDC Ariyankuppam Commune Panchayat
4. R.Valarmathy LDC Ariyankuppam Commune Panchayat
5. P.Kavimany LDC Mannadipet Commune Panchayat
6. S.Sezhian LDC Ariyankuppam Commune Panchayat
7. P.Selvan LDC Mannadipet Commune Panchayat
8. J.Ramanaraj LDC Mannadipet Commune Panchayat
9. A.Arul Mozhi Devan LDC Mannadipet Commune Panchayat Page Nos.7/29
10. S.Illango LDC Villianoor Commune Panchayat
11. N.Manimegalai LDC Thirunallar Commune Panchayat
12. N.Dhanaraman Peon Bahour Commune Panchayat
13. D.Mageswary Peon Neravy Commune Panchayat
14. K.Deeviga Peon T.R.Pattinam Commune Panchayat
15. V.Tamaraiselvi

Peon T.R.Pattinam Commune Panchayat Puducherry. Respondents Writ Petition No.24419 of 2015 filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the second respondent dated 31.07.2015 in G.O.No.15/LAS/2015-16 and to quash the same and consequently, to direct Page Nos.8/29

the second respondent to fill up the 65 posts under various Panchayats by regular selection process. W.P.No.25031 of 2015 For petitioners : Ms.D.Nagasaila For Respondents : Mrs.Sharadha Vivek, Additional Government Pleader (Pondy) for R2 & R3 Mr.Prakash Adiapadam for R4

to R10, R12, R13, R15 and R16 No appearance - R1, R11 & R14 W.P.No.24418 of 2015 For petitioner : Mr.J.Srinivasa Mohan For Respondents : Mrs.Sharadha Vivek, Additional Government Pleader (Pondy) for R1& R2 Mr.Prakash Adiapadam for R3, R9 & R10 No appearance for R4, R5, R6, R7, R8, R11 W.P.No.24419 of 2015 For petitioner : Mr.J.Srinivasa Mohan For Respondents : Mrs.Sharadha Vivek, Additional Government Pleader (Pondy) for R1& R2 Mr.Prakash Adiapadam for R3, R6, R9, R10, R11, R13 and R14 No appearance for R4, R5, R7, R8, R12, R15

Page Nos.9/29

COMMON ORDER

The challenge in all these writ petitions is to the Government Order

dated 31.07.2015 bearing G.O.Ms.No.15/LAS/2015-2016 issued by the first respondent. The said order was passed in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 114 of the Puducherry Municipalities Act, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as the Puducherry Municipalities Act for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity) and under Section 68 of the Puducherry Village and Commune Panchayat Act, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as the Puducherry Panchayat Act for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity). By the said order, approval was granted by the Government to regularise the services of 55 Technical Assistants, 43 Mazdoors and 16 Maistries working under P.S. Charges (Work Charged Establishment) in various Municipalities and Commune Panchayats in the Puducherry, Karaikal, Mahe and Yanam Regions, against existing direct recruitment quota vacancies of Group C posts such as Data Entry Operator, Work Inspector, LDC, Bill Collector Grade-II, Electrician, etc., as a one-time measure by relaxation of the relevant provisions of the Recruitment Rules. Therefore, all these writ petitions were heard together and are being

2. W.P.No.25031 of 2015 has been filed by the Bahour Commune

Panchayat Employees Association, represented by its Secretary. Subsequently, one of the members of the Association was impleaded as Petitioner No.2. In the said writ petition, it is stated that eleven individuals, namely, D.Janarthanan, Anandraj, Vijayabhaskaran, Lakshmansamy, Subramanian, R.Muthu, N.Prasanna, Senthamaraikrishnan, Pushparaj, Vel Murugan, Rajendran, who are members of the petitioner Association, were appointed as daily-rated clerks / daily-rated tank operators through proper

selection via the Employment Exchange, pursuant to the Government Order

dated 27.05.2011 issued by the Government. As per the said Government Order, on the date of notification of the Scheme, the vacancies existing in the relevant posts were to be filled by absorption of eligible full-time casual labourers from the list of full-time casual labourers, as a one-time measure. However, during the currency of the Scheme, namely the Puducherry Municipalities and Commune Panchayat Casual Labourers (Engagement and Regularisation) Scheme, 2011 (hereinafter referred to as Scheme 2011 for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity), the impugned Government

Order came to be issued to appoint work-charged employees in local bodies

and to regularise their services against existing direct recruitment quota vacancies of Group C posts, thereby adversely affecting the seniority of the members of the petitioner Association who are awaiting absorption / regularisation under the

Government Order dated 27.05.2011.

3. W.P.No.24418 of 2015 has been filed by the petitioner stating that

he was engaged as a Tank Operator on a regular basis and that his services in the said post were regularised pursuant to Scheme 2011. He claims entitlement to promotion to the post of LDC, for which the method of appointment is 80% by direct recruitment and 20% by promotion. In such circumstances, the impugned Government Order, which provides for regularisation of work-charged employees in the post of LDC, among other posts, has adversely affected the seniority prospects of the petitioner, who is otherwise entitled to be considered for promotion.

4. W.P.No.24419 of 2015 has been filed by the petitioner stating that

he was engaged as a Watchman on a regular basis in the Villianoor Commune Panchayat. He has passed the XII Standard and has registered his name with the Employment Exchange. His probation period was declared Page Nos.12/29 satisfactory in the year 2006 and, having completed eight years of regular service, he became eligible for promotion to the post of LDC.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners in all the writ

petitions submitted that the impugned Government Order, by which relaxation of the qualifications prescribed under the Recruitment Rules was granted, lacks statutory authority, inasmuch as the said order was not approved by the Administrator / Lieutenant Governor. It was further submitted that the impugned Government Order was issued during the currency of Scheme 2011, thereby adversely affecting the seniority rights of the petitioners. The impugned Government Order resulted in the regularisation of services of work-charged employees in the posts enumerated therein, which are higher posts to which the petitioners are also entitled to seek promotion. By virtue of such regularisation of work-charged employees in the said higher posts, the seniority of the

petitioners has been adversely affected.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners in W.P.No.25031 of 2015

further submitted that the said writ petition is maintainable, as it has been filed espousing the cause of several individuals, as detailed in the affidavit, Page Nos.13/29 who are members of the Employees Association. It was further argued that by way of abundant caution one of the affected individuals has already been impleaded as the Petitioner No.2 and, therefore, the petition filed by the Association, whose members rights have been adversely affected, is maintainable.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioners in W.P.No.25031 of 2015 relied upon the following decisions:

(a) Akhil Bharatiya Soshit Karamchari Sangh (Railway) Vs. Union of India & Others [1981 1 SCC 246];

(b) State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur Vs. State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur Employees Association and others [MANU/TN/0293/1991];

(c) Tamil Nadu Cooperative Subordinate Officers Association Vs. Government of Tamil Nadu and Others [2003 SCC OnLine Mad 428];

(d) The Director of School Education & others Vs. M.Velayutham [W.A.No.313 of 2022 and Batch order dated 02.06.2023]; Page Nos.14/29

(e) State of Orissa and Others Vs. Sukanti Mohapatra and Others [1993] 2 SCC 486; and

(f) Bhupendra Nath Hazarika and another Vs. State of Assam & others [2013] 2 SCC 516.

8. Alternatively, the learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that

it would suffice if the seniority and promotional prospects of the petitioners are protected, since they do not seek to disturb the appointments of the private respondents, who have been in service for more than ten years as on date.

9. In response, the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing

for the Municipalities and the learned counsel for the private respondents submitted that the impugned Government Order was issued in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 114 of the Puducherry Municipalities Act and Section 68 of the Puducherry Panchayat Act. Therefore, it was contended that there was no requirement for approval of the Scheme by the Lieutenant Governor, as alleged by the petitioners. According to them, the

Page Nos.15/29 said statutory provisions themselves empower the Government to modify the service conditions of employees of local bodies.

10. In the present case, the Government issued the impugned

Government Order strictly in conformity with the provisions of the Puducherry Municipalities Act and the Puducherry Panchayat Act. It was further submitted that the said Government Order was passed as a one-time measure, in consonance with the legal principles laid down by the Honble Supreme Court in Secretary, State of Karnataka and Others vs. Umadevi and Others, (2006) 4 SCC 1. It was also contended that the work-charged employees were appointed against vacancies available under the direct recruitment quota, whereas the petitioners were only daily-rated employees seeking absorption. The petitioners whose services were regularised under Scheme 2011 are entitled to appointment to higher posts only by way of promotion and, therefore, the impugned Government Order has not adversely affected any of their legal rights. It was further contended that the writ petition filed by the Association in W.P.No.25031 of 2015 is not maintainable for want of locus standi.

Page Nos.16/29

11. The learned counsel for the private respondents relied upon the following decisions:

(a) W.P.Nos.18615 of 2005 etc., order dated 23.12.2010 (M. Renganathan vs. Union of India and others);

(b) W.P.No.18588 of 2004 dated 21.01.2015 (G. Ganessan @ Manogaran vs. The Secretary to Government, Rural Development and others);

(c) W.P.No.16009 of 2009 dated 17.09.2010 (P. Krishnamoorthy vs. Secretary to Government for Local Administration and others);

(d) Civil Appeal No.1943 of 2022 (Lt. Col. Suprita Chandel vs. Union of India and others);

(e) W.P.No.9325 of 2024 dated 26.03.2025 (Association of Tamil Nadu Highway Engineers vs. The Government of Tamil Nadu and others); and

(f) Secretary, State of Karnataka and others vs. Page Nos.17/29 Umadevi and others, (2006) 4 SCC 1.

12. The arguments of learned counsel for either side and material on record have been duly considered.

13. Insofar as the question regarding the maintainability of W.P.

No.25031 of 2015 is concerned, this Court is of the view that the same need not be gone into in detail. During the pendency of the writ petition, one of the aggrieved members, who is directly affected by the subject matter of the lis, has been subsequently impleaded as Petitioner No.2. In view of such impleadment, the defect, if any, with regard to locus standi or maintainability stands duly cured. Consequently, the writ petition cannot be non-suited on the ground of maintainability, and the said issue does not survive for further adjudication before this Court.

14. The impugned Government Order dated 31.07.2015 was issued in

exercise of the powers conferred under Section 114 of the Puducherry Municipalities Act and Section 68 of the Puducherry Panchayat Act. The said Government Order pertains to the regularisation of the services of 55 Technical Assistants, 43 Mazdoors and 16 Maistries working under P.S. Page Nos.18/29 Charge (Work-Charged Establishment) in various Municipalities and Commune Panchayats. These employees were absorbed and regularised in Group C posts such as Data Entry Operator, Work Inspector, Lower Division Clerk, Bill Collector, etc., by relaxing the relevant provisions of the Recruitment Rules.

15. The question that arises for consideration is whether, when such absorption and regularisation are effected by relaxation of the Recruitment Rules, prior approval of the Lieutenant Governor is required or not.

16. Section 114 of the Puducherry Municipalities Act deals with the

establishment of the Municipal Council. Sub-section (1) of Section 114 provides that the Council may, with the sanction of the Government, create such posts of officers and servants, other than those specified in Sections 111 and 113, as it may deem necessary for the efficient execution of its duties. Sub-section (2) empowers the Government to frame rules regulating qualifications, pay, allowances, discipline, conduct, conditions of service, method of recruitment, and the appointing authority in respect of such posts. Sub-section (3) stipulates that the Council shall, subject to the approval of the Government, decide the manner in which, and the terms and conditions Page Nos.19/29

subject to which, the existing officers and servants shall be absorbed in the posts created under sub-section (1).

17. Section 68 of the Puducherry Panchayat Act, 1973 is *pari materia* with Section 114 of the Puducherry Municipalities Act.

18. A reading of Section 114 of the Puducherry Municipalities Act

makes it clear that, while the Government may formulate a scheme for absorption of existing officers and servants, such absorption must be in conformity with the Recruitment Rules framed under sub-section (2).

19. The term Administrator is defined under Section 2(1) of the

Puducherry Municipalities Act as the Administrator of the Union Territory of Puducherry appointed by the President of India under Article 239 of the Constitution of India. The powers of the Administrator, inter alia, extend to matters relating to the constitution and abolition of Municipalities under Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Puducherry Municipalities Act.

20. Sub-section (2) of Section 114 of the Puducherry Municipalities

Act empowers the Government to frame rules regulating the qualifications, pay, allowances, discipline and conduct, other conditions of service, the Page Nos.20/29 method of recruitment, and the appointing authority in respect of officers and servants of Municipal Councils. The Recruitment Rules so framed by the Government of Puducherry, in exercise of the powers under sub-section

(2) of Section 114, are statutory in character. Further, the rules framed in

exercise of the power under Section 440 of the Puducherry Municipalities Act are required to be placed before the Legislative Assembly, as stipulated under sub-section (4) thereof.

21. As per Rule 17 of the Rules of Business of the Government of

Pondicherry, 1963 (hereinafter referred to as the said Rules for the sake of brevity, convenience and clarity), cases may be disposed of by or under the authority of the Minister-in-charge, who may, by means of standing orders, issue such directions as he deems fit for the disposal of cases in the Department, and copies of such standing orders shall be sent to the Administrator and the Chief Minister. The respondents

contend that the impugned Government Order was approved by the Minister-in-charge of the Municipal Administration Department. However, Rule 25 of the said Rules provides that cases raising questions of policy shall be submitted to the Administrator through the Chief Minister before issuance of orders. The

Page Nos.21/29

petitioners, therefore, contend that the impugned Government Order

required the approval of the Lieutenant Governor, who is the Administrator in the present case, and that the Government Order issued without obtaining such approval stands vitiated.

22. The question as to whether the policy decision of the State

Government to regularise the services of persons working under P.S. Charge (Work-Charged Establishment) in the Municipalities and Commune Panchayats is valid or otherwise need not be gone into, inasmuch as the petitioners through their respective counsels themselves have submitted that it would suffice if their seniority is protected and maintained and that they do not intend to disturb the appointments of the private respondents after a lapse of more than ten years.

23. In view of the above, the validity of the impugned Government

Order need not be gone into in the present batch of writ petitions, since the

scope of the writ petitions filed by the members of the petitioner-Union in W.P.No.25031 of 2015 and by the petitioners in W.P.Nos.24418 and 24419 of 2015 is limited during the course of arguments only to the protection of their seniority and promotional prospects. Page Nos.22/29

24. It is seen that eleven members of the petitioner-Union in

W.P.No.25031 of 2015 were themselves subsequently regularised during the pendency of the said writ petition. The petitioners in W.P.Nos.24418 and 24419 of 2015, who were initially regularised as Tank Operator and Watchman respectively under the Scheme of 2011, have since been promoted to the post of Lower Division Clerk. However, their grievance is that they have been placed below the private respondents in the seniority list, even though the private respondents were regularised to Group C posts only later, pursuant to the Government Order dated 31.07.2015.

25. The question as to whether the petitioners in W.P.Nos.25031, 24418 and 24419 of 2015 are entitled to be placed above the private respondents in the seniority list of their respective cadres requires consideration.

26. The Government of Puducherry issued G.O.Ms.No.2/LAS/2011, Local Administration Secretariat, Puducherry, dated 27.05.2011. By the said Government Order, G.O.Ms.No.135 dated 12.04.1988 was superseded, in Page Nos.23/29

exercise of powers under sub-section (2) of Section 114 of the Puducherry Municipalities Act and sub-section (2) of Section 68 of the Puducherry Panchayat Act, and the Scheme of 2011, namely, The Puducherry Municipalities and Commune Panchayats Casual Labourers (Engagement and Regularisation) Scheme, 2011, was approved. The Scheme of 2011 is applicable to all casual labourers, except those engaged under specific works or schemes, working in Departments of the Government of Puducherry and their attached and subordinate offices, subject to their eligibility under the provisions of the said Scheme.

27. Clause 12 of the Government Order dated 27.05.2011 provides for

publication of the seniority list. Each Municipality or Commune Panchayat concerned shall prepare separate lists of full-time casual

labourers and part- time casual labourers under its engagement, irrespective of the source of engagement, as on 27.02.2009, performing the works of the respective Municipality or Commune Panchayat. The draft list shall be published calling for objections, if any, within a period of fifteen days and thereafter the list shall be finalized with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor.

Page Nos.24/29

28. Clause 14 of the Government Order dated 27.05.2011 provides for

absorption against erstwhile Group D posts. As per the said clause, all full- time casual labourers shall be absorbed only in the appropriate erstwhile Group D posts (initial category), which have now been reclassified as Group C posts in the entry level category.

29. Clause 13 of the Government Order dated 27.05.2011 provides for

absorption of full-time casual labourers. It stipulates that wherever absorption is prescribed as a method of recruitment in the Recruitment Rules, the vacancies existing in the relevant posts as on the date of notification of the Scheme shall be filled up by absorption of eligible full-time casual labourers from the list maintained by the Municipality or Commune Panchayat concerned.

30. The petitioners were appointed under the Scheme of 2011 and the

members of the petitioner-Union who were placed in the waiting list were also appointed to the relevant entry-level posts during the pendency of these writ petitions. The members of the petitioner-Union in W.P.No.25031 of 2015 were appointed as daily-rated clerks / daily-rated tank operators, while the petitioners in W.P.Nos.24418 and 24419 of 2015 were appointed as

Page Nos.25/29

Tank Operator and Watchman respectively and were subsequently promoted to the post of Lower Division Clerk during the pendency of these writ petitions.

31. The impugned Government Order was issued in the year 2015 and the same is neither in supersession nor in modification of the Government

Order dated 27.05.2011. During the currency of the Government Order

dated 27.05.2011, the impugned Government Order came to be issued. The petitioners had, therefore, acquired a vested right to be considered for regularisation under the Government Order dated 27.05.2011.

32. However, by virtue of the impugned Government Order, work-

charged employees, who had been appointed directly to higher posts in the category reserved for direct recruits, were regularised. Such regularisation has adversely affected the rights of the petitioners, as they were entitled to regularisation prior to the work-charged employees. Consequently, in the event of their promotion to the next higher post, the petitioners would be placed below the work-charged employees.

33. Such a situation would undoubtedly and adversely affect the

vested rights of the petitioners and would be arbitrary and discriminatory. Page Nos.26/29 Therefore, to this extent, W.P. Nos. 25031, 24418 and 24419 of 2015 stand allowed.

34. Therefore, the Secretary to the Government, Local Administration

Department, Government of Puducherry, Puducherry, is directed to place the eleven individuals detailed in the writ petition, who are members of the petitioner-Union in W.P. No. 25031 of 2015 and the petitioners in W.P. Nos. 24418 and 24419 of 2015, above the private respondents in these writ petitions in their respective cadres in the seniority list

maintained by the second respondent, and to grant them further promotion, if they are otherwise eligible, in accordance with law. The petitioners are permitted to file representation in this regard with the Secretary to the Government, Local Administration Department, Government of Puducherry, Puducherry.

35. The said exercise shall be completed within a period of four

months from the date of receipt of representations to be submitted by the Petitioners. It is made clear that this order is confined only to the petitioners herein and shall not enure to the benefit of other persons who have been regularised under Government Order dated 27.05.2011, as they have not challenged the impugned Government Order. Page Nos.27/29

36. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. There shall be no order as to costs. 16.02.2026 Index : Yes Neutral Citation : Yes Speaking / Non-speaking mk To

1. The Director Local Administration Department Pondicherry.

2. The Government of Pondicherry Represented by its Secretary Department of Local Administration Chief Secretariat, Pondicherry.

3. Union of India By Government of Puducherry Rep. by its Chief Secretary Chief Secretariat, Goubert Avenue Puducherry - 605 001.

4. The Under Secretary to Government Local Administration Government of Puducherry Puducherry - 605 001. Page Nos.28/29 HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR, J., mk 16.02.2026 Page Nos.29/29

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