

WEB COPY



W.P Nos.26245, 26248, 26250 & 26253 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.07.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C. KUMARAPPAN

Writ Petition Nos.26245, 26248, 26250 & 26253 of 2025

Mr.Velusamy	... Petitioner in WP.26245/2025
Mr.S.Sudhakar	... Petitioner in WP 26248/2025
Mr.M.Mathews	... Petitioner in WP 26250/2025
Mr.Sebastian	... Petitioner in WP 26253/2025
..Vs..	

1.The Chairman, TANGEDCO,
Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.

2.The Chief Engineer (Personal),
And convener committee,
TANGEDCO, Anna Salai,
Chennai – 600 002.

3.The Superintending Engineer,
Parsonvalley, Power House Project VI,
Emerald Post, & Village, Kundhah Takuk,
Ooty, The Nilgiris District – 643 209.

4.The Superintending Engineer/Civil,
Hydro Project, 955, E.V.N.Road,
Erode – 638 009.

... Respondents in all WPs



WEB COPY

COMMON PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a writ of Mandamus to direct all the respondents to consider the Writ Appeal No.1302 of 2003 order dated 24.10.2008 submitted by the petitioner along with others, and to pass appropriate orders on merits after affording an opportunity of personal hearing, and consequently absorb the petitioner as a regular Helper in the service of the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board (now TANGEDCO), on par with other employees, by granting the benefit of ex-gratia payment from the date of his initial engagement on 01.06.1994 till the date of his regular absorption, and to extend all other consequential service and monetary benefits on par with his juniors who have already been absorbed into service.


For Petitioner in all WPs : Mr.G.Ilamurugu

For Respondents in all WPs : Mr.A.P.Venkatesh Prasad
For M/s.Advit Law Chambers

COMMON ORDER

The present writ petitions have been filed with a prayer for mandamus to direct all the respondents to consider the Judgment in Writ Appeal No.1302 of 2003 dated 24.10.2008.

2.The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners would submit that the petitioners have been disengaged from the employment since 2000, whereas, the similarly placed persons have been regularized and in this connection, the petitioners had given various representations to the respondents. Hence, the petitioners have come up with the present writ petitions to direct the respondents to pass an order in the light of the Division




Bench Judgment of this Court in W.A.No.1302 of 2003 batch case dated 24.10.2008.

WEB COPY

3. At this juncture, the learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents would vehemently contend that the similar prayer was sought in the batch of writ petitions in W.P.No.16862 of 2021 vide order dated 04.01.2024, wherein, this Court had directed the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation and based on the direction, the petitioner's representation was considered on 01.07.2024 wherein, the issue involved in the present writ petitions has been dealt in para 11 of the Judgment dated 24.10.2008. Hence, the learned counsel would contend that there is no merits in the present writ petitions.

4. I have given my anxious consideration to either side submissions and also perused the materials available on record.

5. As rightly contended by the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents, the petitioner had already been approached this Court, by way of the batch of writ petition No.16862/2021, wherein, this Court, vide order



W.P Nos.26245, 26248, 26250 & 26253 o. 2025

dated 04.01.2024 directing the respondents to consider the petitioners' representation. In pursuance thereof, the respondents had considered the petitioners' representation on 01.07.2024 and rejected their claim. Therefore, without challenging the Rejection Order, the petitioners cannot file a fresh writ petitions again seeking a direction for consideration of the representation on the basis of yet another writ appeal Judgment. It is also relevant to mention that the petitioners were disengaged from the employment, since 2000, hence at this length of time, nothing to be interfered with. Therefore, this Court does not find any merits in the present writ petitions and the same is liable to be quashed.

6. In the result, the writ petitions are dismissed. However the petitioners are given liberty to challenge the impugned order dated 01.07.2024 issued by the Superintending Engineer/Civil, Erode, in accordance with law. No costs.

21.07.2025

ssi


Index : Yes

Speaking Order : Yes /No

Neutral Citation Case: Yes/No

To:

4/6



W.P Nos.26245, 26248, 26250 & 26253 of 2023

WEB COPY

1.The Chairman, TANGEDCO,
Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.


2.The Chief Engineer (Personal),
And convener committee,
TANGEDCO, Anna Salai,
Chennai – 600 002.

3.The Superintending Engineer,
Parsonvalley, Power House Project VI,
Emerald Post, & Village, Kundhah Takuk,
Ooty, The Nilgiris District – 643 209.

4.The Superintending Engineer/Civil,
Hydro Project, 955, E.V.N.Road,
Erode – 638 009.

C. KUMARAPPAN, J.

ssi



WEB COPY



W.P Nos.26245, 26248, 26250 & 26253 of 2025

W.P.Nos.26245, 26248, 26250 & 26253 of 2025

21.07.2025