

P. Ramasamy Vs. the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission, Represented by Its Secretary

P. Ramasamy Vs. the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission, Represented by Its Secretary

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/829475

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Sep-17-1998

Reported in : (1999)1MLJ1

Appellant : P. Ramasamy

Respondent : The Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission, Represented by Its Secretary

Judgement :

ORDER

Shivaraj Patil, J.

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner.
2. The petitioner in this writ petition has sought for a writ of certiorarified mandamus calling for the records relating to Memorandum No. 6746/APD-CJA/98 dated 11.09.1998 on the file of the respondent, quash the same and further direct the respondent to treat the petitioner's application as valid application as per notification dated 2.7.1998 and pass such further orders as it may deem fit.
3. The impugned memorandum reads:-

Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission

Memorandum No. 6746/APD-CJA/98 Dated 11.9.98.

Sub: Recruitment (Direct) - Civil Judge (Junior Division/Judicial Magistrate, First Class) in the Tamil Nadu State Judicial Service - Application rejected - Regarding.

Ref: Application from Thiru P. Ramassamy.

Thiru P. Ramassamy (Appln. No. 211188) is informed that his application for direct recruitment to the post of civil Judge (Junior Division/Judicial Magistrate, First Class) in the Tamil Nadu State Judicial Service has been rejected for the following reason:

According to para 5 of the Commission's Notification dated 2.7.98, the candidate must be practising as an advocate or pleader or working as Assistant Public Prosecutor Grade I or Grade II and must have so practised/worked for a period of not less than 4 years, as on the said date, whereas the candidate is working as Junior Clerk, Chief Judicial Magistrate's Court, Pondicherry. 2. Requests for reconsideration of this memo will receive no attention.

A.V. Seshadri

Deputy Secretary

Sd/(11.9.1998)'

Section Officer.

4. The application of the petitioner was rejected on the ground that the petitioner was not a practising advocate as on 2.7.1998 and was working as Junior Clerk on that date. According to the notification dated 2.7.1998 issued by the respondent, advocate practising as on the date of the said notification, having four years of practice was eligible to apply. Admittedly, the petitioner was not a practising advocate as on 2.7.1998.

5. Learned Counsel for the petitioner, based on the general instructions, issued by the respondent submitted that a person in the service of Indian Union or of a state in India or in the employment of local bodies or Universities need apply through the competent authorities with their 'no objection certificates'. According to him, this instruction is an indication that the petitioner, even though was working as a clerk as on 2.7.1998, could apply through proper channel and he had practised for about seven years before joining service. Learned Counsel for the petitioner also contended that the petitioner satisfies the requirement that he should have four years bar experience, though he has ceased to practice as an advocate as on 2.7.1998 in view of the fact that he has joined service in the judicial department.

6. We have considered the submissions of learned Counsel for the petitioner. The notification issued by the respondent clearly states that a candidate on the date of notification, i.e., on 2.7.1998 must be (a) practising as an Advocate or pleader and must have so practised for a period of not less than four years as on the said date. A plain reading of Paragraph-5 of the notification does not leave any doubt whatsoever, that a candidate must be a practising advocate as on the date of notification i.e., on 2.7.1998 and must have so practised for a period of not less than four years. It is true that the petitioner satisfies the second part of the Clause (a) of para-graph-5, but he fails to satisfy the first part of paragraph-5 since he was not practising as an advocate as on 2.7.1998.

7. Applications are invited for recruitment by the respondent under the Tamil Nadu State Judicial Services (Cadre and Recruitment) Rules, 1995. The relevant portion of Rule 5 of the above said Rules reads:

5. Method of appointment, qualification and age: In respect of each category of posts specified in column (1) of the Schedule below, the method of appointment and the qualification shall be specified in the corresponding entries in columns (2) and (3) thereof:

Category

Method of appointment

Qualification

4. Civil Judge (Junior Division/Judicial Magistrate, First Class)

By direct recruitment on the basis of written examination/and viva voce examination conducted by the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission in accordance with the rules specified in the annexure to these rules.

1. Must be a holder of a degree in law.

2. Must on the date of Notification be:

(a) Practising as an Advocate or Pleader and must have so practised for a period of not less than

four years as on such date.'

As could be seen from Rule 5 extracted above, a candidate who was practising as an Advocate or pleader must have so practised for a period of not less than four years as on such date in the instant as on 2.7.1998 - the date on which the notification was issued, to be eligible to apply. In the Annexure to Rule 5 as per paragraph 2, a candidate along with his application has to produce a certificate from the Presiding officer of the court in which he is actually practising, indicating the length of his practice.

8. Thus, the relevant rule and the instructions clearly indicate that as on the relevant date, i.e., as on 2.7.1998, the petitioner, not being a practising advocate, - was not eligible to apply. In that view, the respondent was right in rejecting his application by the impugned memorandum. Merely because a provision is available in the general instructions issued to the candidates, that persons who are in service of either Indian Union or State shall apply through proper channel, the contention of the learned Counsel for the petitioner is not acceptable as against the expressed provision relating to the very same recruitment.

9. In this view, the writ petition is rejected. No costs. Consequently, the connected W.M.P. is also rejected.

