WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 19.08.2026	Pronounced on : 17.11.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR

W.P.No.27778 of 2026
and
W.M.P.No.30443 of 2026

S.Marimuthu ... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Tamil Nadu,
   Represented by the Secretary to Government,
   Higher Education Department,
   Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The Commissioner,
   Collegiate Education,
   Annamalai, Saidapet,
   Chennai – 600 015.

3. Teachers' Recruitment Board,
   Represented by it s Member Secretary,
   DPI Campus, Chennai – 600 006. ... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of mandamus, directing to consider the candidature of the petitioner also for the post of 'Assistant Professor (Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology) by taking into consideration the fact that the petitioner's qualification has been declared as equivalent vide G.O (Ms) No.243, Higher Education Department,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 18/11/2026 12:50:01 pm)

WEB COPY

dated 07.11.2022 and by taking into consideration the fact that the question paper for Assistant Professor (Botany) and Assistant (Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology) are one and the same and accordingly include the name of the petitioner as an eligible candidate for the post of 'Assistant Professor (Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology) and select and appoint him to the post of 'Assistant Professor (Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology) if he comes within the one of consideration.

For Petitioner	: Ms.Dakshyani Reddy, Senior Counsel for Ms.S.Suneetha
For Respondent	: Mr.K.Sathish, AGP (For R1 & R2) Mr.R.Siddharth, SC for TRB

O R D E R

In response to a notification issued by the third respondent/Teachers' Recruitment Board, vide Notification No.04/2025 dated 16.10.2025, for direct recruitment to the post of 'Assistant Professor' in the Tamil Nadu Collegiate Educational Service for Government Arts and Science Colleges and Government Colleges of Education – 2025, the petitioner submitted an online application for the post of 'Assistant Professor in Botany' and accordingly, appeared for the written examination and was declared as 'Qualified' in the said written examination consisting of Paper-I and Paper-II. In both the papers put together, the petitioner secured 83 marks. The recruitment process is yet to be concluded after conducting the oral test. It was at that stage that the petitioner approached

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 18/11/2026 12:50:01 pm)

WEB COPY

this Court by filing the present writ petition, contending that the application submitted by him is for the post of 'Assistant Professor in Botany' as well as the post of 'Assistant Professor in Plant Biology and Plant Bio Technology' and the said application is common for both the posts. It is further contended that the question paper in both the subjects is one and the same and the application submitted by the petitioner also would disclose that the same is for the post of 'Assistant Professor' in both the subjects, but his candidature is being considered only for the post of 'Assistant Professor in Botany' and is not being considered for the post of 'Assistant Professor (Plant Biology)' and 'Assistant Professor (Plant Bio Technology)'. It is further contended that the qualification possessed by the petitioner, i.e., M.Sc. (Botany), is treated as an equivalent qualification to that of M.Sc. (Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology) and vice versa for the purpose of employment in public service in the State of Tamil Nadu, by virtue of orders issued by the Government vide G.O.(Ms.) No.243, Higher Education (K2) Department, dated 07.11.2022. Thus, the petitioner claims that his candidature shall be considered for the post of 'Assistant Professor' in both the subjects, i.e., Botany and 'Plant Biology' & 'Plant Bio Technology'.

2. In the light of the results declared by the respondent Board, the name of the petitioner is shown at Sl.No.571, by virtue of his marks, in respect of the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 18/11/2026 12:50:01 pm)

WEB COPY

candidates who appeared for the post of 'Assistant Professor (Botany)', whereas, in the list of candidates who applied for 'Assistant Professor (Plant Biology & Plant Bio Technology)', the name of the petitioner is not shown, though the list of all the 72 candidates who appeared for the said subject was published.

3. In response to the notice issued by this Court, the respondent TRB filed a detailed counter-affidavit, contending that although 61 subjects have been notified, the said 61 subjects were grouped into 48 subjects for the purpose of conducting the written examination and, in the said process, the subjects of Botany, Plant Biology and Plant Bio Technology were grouped together only for the purpose of conducting the written examination. Therefore, the same does not entitle the petitioner to claim consideration of his case for both the subjects. It is further stated that, in the online application submitted by the petitioner, the petitioner has categorically mentioned, while furnishing his Post Graduate Degree details, against the column 'Is the subject mentioned a direct subject or an equivalent subject as per the notification', by answering the same as 'Direct Subject' as per the notification. The name of the major subject claimed under the abovesaid head is 'M.Sc. (Botany)'. Thus, it is contended that the petitioner claimed 'M.Sc. (Botany)' as a direct subject, but not as an equivalent qualification by virtue of the orders issued by the Government on equivalence. If

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 18/11/2026 12:50:01 pm)

WEB COPY

at all the petitioner had applied for the post of 'Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology', the petitioner would have mentioned under the abovesaid column as 'Equivalent Subject'. Thus, from the above, the respondent Board contends that the petitioner has consciously applied only for the post of 'Assistant Professor (Botany)', but not for both the subjects as claimed. It is further stated that the Hall Ticket issued pursuant to his online application is very much specific only in respect of 'Botany' against the column 'Subject Applied For', whereas, against the subjects grouped for the purpose of the written examination, it is mentioned as 'Botany/Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology'. Thus, it is contended that the petitioner is very much aware that he was permitted to appear for the examination only for the Botany subject, but not for the Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology subject. It is further contended that, in terms of Clause 8(ix) of the notification in question, every candidate shall apply only for one subject. Thus, even if the petitioner claims to have submitted an application for two subjects, his candidature can be considered only against one subject, but not more.

4. Heard Ms.Dakshayani Reddy, learned Senior Counsel for Ms.S.Suneetha, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr.K.Sathish, learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 and 2, and

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 18/11/2026 12:50:01 pm)

WEB COPY

Mr.R.Siddharth, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent Board. This Court has carefully considered the submissions made on either side and also perused the entire material available on record.

5. The only question that would arise for consideration before this Court is whether the petitioner is right in contending that he has applied for the post of 'Assistant Professor' in both the subjects, i.e., (i) Botany and (ii) Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology, or not?

6. In order to ascertain this, it has to be seen as to whether the petitioner is entitled to make an application in respect of two subjects or not. As rightly contended by the respondent TRB, in terms of Clause (ix) of Paragraph No.8 of the notification, the candidate should apply only for one subject. The said clause reads as under:-

"ix. The candidates should apply for only one subject"

7. There is no dispute about the abovesaid clause being incorporated in the notification in question, and the petitioner herein, while submitting his online application, categorically declared that he had gone through the instructions to the applicants contained in the notification before filling up the application form

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 18/11/2026 12:50:01 pm)

WEB COPY

and also undertook to abide by the same. He also further declared that he had checked all the details furnished in his application at various stages and that the entire information furnished by the petitioner in the application was correct. Thus, it is evident that the petitioner was fully conscious of the fact that he could submit an application only for one subject out of the 61 subjects notified under the notification in question.

8. Admittedly, the subjects of 'Botany' and 'Plant Biology & Plant Biotechnology' are two different subjects. If that be the case, it is not understood as to how the petitioner can claim to have submitted an application for both the subjects. Once the notification under which the petitioner has participated in the recruitment process restricts a candidate to apply for only one subject, the petitioner, having participated in the recruitment process pursuant to the said notification, cannot now come around and claim that he has applied for more than one subject under any circumstances. Insofar as 'Botany' subject is concerned, there is no dispute.

9. Be that as it may, even assuming that the petitioner has applied for two subjects, as is being claimed by him, if the same is correct, the petitioner is under an obligation to upload the orders on equivalence, i.e., G.O.(Ms.) No.243 dated

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 18/11/2026 12:50:01 pm)

WEB COPY

07.11.2022, along with his online application, as the M.Sc. (Botany) degree possessed by him is not one of the notified qualifications for the post of 'Assistant Professor (Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology)'. If at all the candidature of the petitioner is to be considered for the post of 'Assistant Professor (Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology)', the same is possible only if the petitioner duly uploaded the orders on equivalence along with his online application. In Paragraph No.9 of the notification, the list of documents to be submitted is set out. In the said list of documents, the evidence for equivalence of qualification, if applicable, is at Sl.No.(ix). If the petitioner's claim is true, the petitioner, while submitting his online application, ought to have uploaded the orders issued vide G.O.(Ms.) No.243 dated 07.11.2022 as well. But, from the list of documents that were uploaded by the petitioner along with his online application, as is seen from a copy of the online application, there are only 15 documents, and the orders on equivalence are conspicuously absent. Thus, it is amply clear that the petitioner never intended to apply for both the subjects, as is being claimed, but it is only after the results were declared in the written examination, and having found himself placed at Sl.No.571 in respect of 'Botany' subject, while only 72 candidates had applied for the post of 'Plant Biology and Plant Biotechnology', and that, by virtue of his marks, he would have been placed between Sl.Nos.57 and 58, out of 72 candidates, that the petitioner appears to have entertained an

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 18/11/2026 12:50:01 pm)

WEB COPY

afterthought. It is only by virtue of the said afterthought that the petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present writ petition.

10. In the light of the above, especially in the context of the fact that no candidate can apply for more than one subject in terms of the notification, the very claim made by the petitioner is frivolous, baseless and is nothing but an abuse of the process of this Court. Though this is a fit case to impose costs on the petitioner, considering the fact that the petitioner appears to be an unemployed, this Court is refraining itself from imposing costs on the petitioner for making a frivolous claim.

11. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Connected miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

17.11.2026

skr
Index : Yes / No
Speaking order / Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation : Yes / No

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 18/11/2026 12:50:01 pm)

WEB COPY

MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR, J.

skr

To

1. The Secretary to Government of Tamil Nadu,
   Higher Education Department,
   Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.

2. The Commissioner, Collegiate Education,
   Annamalai, Saidapet, Chennai – 600 015.

3. The Member Secretary,
   Teachers' Recruitment Board,
   DPI Campus, Chennai – 600 006.

Pre-Delivery Order made in
W.P.No.27778 of 2026

17.11.2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis (Uploaded on: 18/11/2026 12:50:01 pm)