

Item No.12 :

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).81-83/2017
(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 22/12/2016
in WP Nos.4113, 4161 & 4584 of 2016 passed by the High Court Of
Madras)

STATE OF TAMIL NADU REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, SECRETARIAT, FORT. ST.
GEORGE, CHENNAI AND ETC. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

T.K.S. ELANGO VAN AND ORS. ETC. ETC.
(With interim relief)

Respondent(s)

Item No.17 :

SLP(C)Nos.258-260/2017

(With interim relief and office report)

WITH

SLP(C)Nos.262-264/2017

(With interim relief and office report)

Date : 09/01/2017 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE D.Y. CHANDRACHUD

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE L. NAGESWARA RAO

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Mukul Rohtagi,AG
SLP(C)Nos.81-83 Mr. Subramonium Prasad,Sr.Adv.

Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna,Adv.

Ms. Nithya,Adv.

SLP(C)Nos.258-60 Mr. K.K. Venugopal,Sr.Adv.

Mr. Shyam Divan,Sr.Adv.

Mr. A. Navaneethakrishnan,Sr.Adv.

Mr. C. Paramasivam,Adv.

Mr. P. Ramesh,Adv.

Mr. Y. Arunagiri,Adv.

Mr. M.P. Parthiban,Adv.

Mr. N. Umapathy,Adv.

1

SLP(C)Nos.262-64 Mr. Chander Uday Singh,Sr.Adv.

Mr. C. Paramasivam,Adv.

Mr. P. Ramesh,Adv.

Mr. Y. Arunagiri,Adv.

Mr. M.P. Parthiban,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. P. Wilson,Sr.Adv.

No.1/Caveator Mr. R. Nedumaran,Adv.

No.2(TNPSC) Mr. K.V. Vijaya Kumar,Adv.

Mr. S. Thananjayan,Adv.

Mr. K. Balu,Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Leave granted.

No stay, except insofar as the observations recorded
in paragraph 22.11.(b) of the impugned order, which are
ordered to be kept in abeyance. Additionally, paragraph
22.11.(d) shall not be implemented, to the extent it
requires a meaningful consultative process. It is
clarified, that for sub-paragraph (d) afore-mentioned, a
meaningful and effective deliberative process will be
required, for a selection process to be valid.

With the aforesaid observations, we permit the
petitioner-State to enter upon a fresh selection process
for Members of the Public Service Commission.

We also clarify, that Respondent No.10 will remain
ineligible, for any such fresh selection and appointment.

(Sarita Purohit)

(Renuka Sadana)

Court Master

Assistant Registrar

ITEM NO.12+17 COURT NO.1 SECTION XII
S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Item No.12 :

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).81-83/2017
(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 22/12/2016
in WP Nos.4113, 4161 & 4584 of 2016 passed by the High Court Of
Madras)

STATE OF TAMIL NADU REPRESENTED BY ITS CHIEF
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, SECRETARIAT, FORT. ST.
GEORGE, CHENNAI AND ETC. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

T.K.S. ELANGO VAN AND ORS. ETC. ETC.

Respondent(s)

(With interim relief)

Item No.17 :

SLP(C)Nos.258-260/2017

(With interim relief and office report)

WITH

SLP(C)Nos.262-264/2017

(With interim relief and office report)

Date : 09/01/2017 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE D.Y. CHANDRACHUD

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE L. NAGESWARA RAO

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Mukul Rohtagi,AG

SLP(C)Nos.81-83 Mr. Subramonium Prasad,Sr.Adv.

Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna,Adv.

Ms. Nithya,Adv.

SLP(C)Nos.258-60 Mr. K.K. Venugopal,Sr.Adv.

Mr. Shyam Divan,Sr.Adv.

Mr. A. Navaneethakrishnan,Sr.Adv.

Mr. C. Paramasivam,Adv.

Mr. P. Ramesh,Adv.

Mr. Y. Arunagiri,Adv.

Mr. M.P. Parthiban,Adv.

Mr. N. Umapathy,Adv.

3

SLP(C)Nos.262-64 Mr. Chander Uday Singh,Sr.Adv.

Mr. C. Paramasivam,Adv.

Mr. P. Ramesh,Adv.

Mr. Y. Arunagiri,Adv.

Mr. M.P. Parthiban,Adv.

For Respondent(s)

No.1/Caveator Mr. R. Nedumaran,Adv.

No.2(TNPSC) Mr. K.V. Vijaya Kumar,Adv.

Mr. S. Thananjayan,Adv.

Mr. K. Balu,Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Leave granted.

No stay, except insofar as the observations recorded

in paragraph 22.11.(b) of the impugned order, which are

ordered to be kept in abeyance. Additionally, paragraph

22.11.(d) shall not be implemented, to the extent it

requires a meaningful consultative process. It is

clarified, that for sub-paragraph (d) afore-mentioned, a

meaningful and effective deliberative process will be

required, for a selection process to be valid.

With the aforesaid observations, we permit the

petitioner-State to enter upon a fresh selection process

for Members of the Public Service Commission.

We also clarify, that Respondent No.10 will remain

ineligible, for any such fresh selection and appointment.

(Sarita Purohit)

(Renuka Sadana)

www.ecourtsindia.com
www.ecourtsindia.com
www.ecourtsindia.com
www.ecourtsindia.com
www.ecourtsindia.com
www.ecourtsindia.com
www.ecourtsindia.com
www.ecourtsindia.com
www.ecourtsindia.com
www.ecourtsindia.com

Court Master

Assistant Registrar