

candidates who were admitted to the State services, whose services were sought to be terminated, had been appointed by the State of Tamil Nadu. It is also case of the applicants praying for review of the judgment that certain methods, which had been adopted by the High Court while coming to the final conclusion arrived at, by virtue of the judgment delivered by the Division Bench, were not proper and therefore, the selection made by Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission should not have been set aside, especially when all the candidates who had been selected by Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission and who had been appointed to different State services by the State of Tamil Nadu were in service for more than 7-8 years with due

4

efficiency and their effectiveness as officers was never questioned even by their superiors or by the State of Tamil Nadu. It was also submitted that grave injustice would be caused to those officers working for several years as their services will be terminated and they will not get any chance to get any employment elsewhere as they have already crossed the age limit for applying for any other government post by virtue of afflux of time and that too for no fault on their part.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel appearing for the original petitioners before the High Court submitted that the judgment sought to be reviewed is just and proper and therefore, there is no reason to disturb the said judgment, especially in view of the fact that the review applications had been filed after a long time and it would not be in the interest of society to continue such officers, who had been improperly or irregularly selected. According to the learned counsel, a message must go to the society that no irregularity committed while examining the answer books can be tolerated

6. Several submissions were made by the learned counsel appearing for the original petitioners before the High Court with regard to use of colour pencils, pens etc. by the candidates while answering the question papers. Different views were expressed by different counsel even at the stage when the matter was pending before the High Court, when the High

5

Court had appointed court officers to examine the answer books. Different views were expressed by different persons and even different views were expressed when the answer books had been examined at the instance of this Court by independent examiners of Union Public Service Commission. Be that as it may, at this stage, when the candidates who were appointed and who have been working as State Officers for more than 10 years or so and when the examiners, who have rechecked the answer books, have expressed little different views and in view of the fact that the selected candidates did not get any opportunity to represent their cases before the High Court as very little time was given to them to appear before the High Court, it would be just and proper to review the judgment.

7. It is not in dispute that notices had been issued by the High Court to the selected candidates, which were made returnable on 2 nd

March, 2011 and the matter had been finally decided on 4 th

March, 2011. It is thus clear that sufficient time was not given to the selected candidates to represent their cases before the High Court and the said fact has been now brought to the notice of this Court. Thus, the submission made on behalf of the selected candidates are found to be correct and in fact they did not get adequate opportunity to represent their case effectively before the learned Single Judge.

8. Having overall view of the matter, in the interest of

6

administration as well as in the interest of the candidates, who

have already passed the examination held by Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission and have been appointed by the State of Tamil Nadu in State services before several years, in exercise of powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India, we direct that the candidates who have been working in different services of Tamil Nadu State shall be continued in service, notwithstanding any order passed by the Division Bench of Madras High Court and confirmed by this Court.

9. We have adopted this course mainly for the reason that the selected candidates did not get sufficient opportunity to represent their case before the High Court, as stated hereinabove and upon hearing the concerned counsel and upon perusal of the record and report received from Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission as well as Union Public Service Commission, we also find that the mistakes, if any, committed by the candidates who have now been selected, were very often ignored and therefore, it would not be just and proper to take such a harsh view in the matter so as to render several reasonably good officers working for several years jobless. Moreover, in any case, the original petitioners who had filed the petition, are not likely to have any benefit because in any case they had failed at the examination held by Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission and therefore, there is no question of

7

giving any appointment to them at this stage.

10. For the aforesaid reasons the review applications are allowed only to the above extent by exercising our power under Article 142 of the Constitution of India. All interlocutory applications and the contempt petitions are also disposed of accordingly.

.â |â |â |â |â |â |â |â |â |.J.

(ANIL R. DAVE)

â |â |â |â |â |â |â |â |..J.

(DIPAK MISRA)

NEW DELHI
SEPTEMBER 15, 2016.

8

REVISED
ITEM NO.1C
(For Judgment)

COURT NO.2

SECTION XII

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

I.A. Nos.15-18/2014 in Civil Appeal No(s). 5877-5878/2014
SECRETARY TAMILNADU PUBLIC SERVICE COMM Appellant(s)
VERSUS

A.B.NATARAJAN & ORS.ETC. Respondent(s)

WITH

I.A. NO.3 in C.A. No. 5879/2014 & R.P.(C) NO.2624/2014 IN C.A.
No.5879/2014

I.A. Nos.23-24 in C.A. No. 5880-5881/2014

I.A. Nos.41-42 in C.A. No. 5882-5883/2014

I.A. No.3 in C.A. No. 5884/2014 & R.P.(c) No.2119/2014 in CA.
No.5884/2014

R.P.(C) Nos.2025-2026/2014 in C.A. Nos.5877-5878/2014

C.P.(C) D 31357/2014 IN I.A. Nos.15-16 in C.A. Nos. 5882-5883/2014

C.P.(C) D 31358/2014 IN I.A. No.24 in C.A. Nos. 5880-5881/2014

R.P.(C) Nos.2628-2629/2014 in C.A. Nos.5882-5883/2014

R.P.(C) Nos.210-211/2015 in C.A. Nos.5880-5881/2014

R.P.(C) Nos.201-202/2015 in C.A. Nos.5882-5883/2014

Date : 15/09/2016 These matters were called on for pronouncement
of judgment.

For Appellant(s)

Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna,AOR

Ms. Nithya,Adv.

Mr. Subhasish Bhowmick,AOR

Mr. V. Balachandran, AOR

Mr. V. G. Pragasam, AOR

Mr. S. Prabhu Ramasubramanian, Adv.

9

Mr. Jayanth Muth Raj, Adv.

Mrs. Malavika J., Adv.

Mr. Sureshan P., AOR

Mr. S. Srinivasan, AOR

In RP.201-202/15 Mr. Ashok K. Mahajan, AOR

For Respondent(s)

Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, AOR

Mr. B. Balaji, AOR

Mr. Muthu Vel Palani, Adv.

Mr. Aravind Athithan, Adv.

Mr. Naresh Kumar, AOR

Mr. R. V. Kameshwaran, AOR

Mr. C. K. Sasi, AOR

Mr. G. Ananda Selvam, Adv.

Mr. K. Mayil Samy, Adv.

Mr. Ram Sankar, Adv.

Mr. Y. Lokesh, Adv.

Mr. Ravindra Keshavrao Adsure, AOR

Ms. T. Anamika, AOR

Mr. Balaji Srinivasan, AOR

Ms. Vaishnavi Subrahmanyam, Adv.

Ms. Srishti Govil, Adv.

Mr. B. Ramana Murthy, AOR

Mrs. Geetha Kovilan, AOR

Mr. Anant Varma, Adv.

Mr. Ramendra Mohan Patnaik, AOR

Mr. Ashok K. Mahajan, AOR

Mr. S. Muthu Krishnan, Adv.

Mr. Reegan S. Bell, Adv.

Honble Mr. Justice Anil R. Dave pronounced the judgment of the Bench comprising His Lordship and Honble Mr. Justice Dipak Misra.

10

...8. Having overall view of the matter, in the interest of administration as well as in the interest of the candidates, who have already passed the examination held by Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission and have been appointed by the State of Tamil Nadu in State services before several years, in exercise of powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India, we direct that the candidates who have been working in different services of Tamil Nadu State shall be continued in service, notwithstanding any order passed by the Division Bench of Madras High Court and confirmed by this Court.

9. We have adopted this course mainly for the reason that the selected candidates did not get sufficient opportunity to represent their case before the High Court, as stated hereinabove and upon hearing the concerned counsel and upon perusal of the record and report received from Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission as well as Union Public Service Commission, we also find that the mistakes, if any, committed by the candidates who have now been selected, were very often ignored and therefore, it would not be just and proper to take such a harsh view in the matter so as to render several reasonably good officers working for several years jobless. Moreover, in any case, the original petitioners who had

filed the petition, are not likely to have any benefit because in any case they had failed at the examination held by Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission and therefore, there is no question of giving any appointment to them at this stage.

10. For the aforestated reasons the review applications are allowed only to the above extent by exercising our power under Article 142 of the Constitution of India. All interlocutory applications and the contempt petitions are also disposed of accordingly.

(NARENDRA PRASAD) (SNEH BALA MEHRA)

COURT MASTER ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(Signed 'Reportable' Judgment is placed on the file)