

## **The Hindu**

### **More than 4,000 job applicants rejected for being ‘over-age’, CJM tells court**

The Madras High Court Bench here has been informed that more than 4,000 job applications, made by various individuals pursuant to a recruitment notification issued by the Chief Judicial Magistrate’s court here in June this year, had to be rejected since the notification by mistake stated that there was no age limit for those who had completed Plus Two and possessed bachelor’s degrees.

A Division Bench of Justices M. Sathyanarayanan and V.M. Velumani was apprised of the issue during the hearing of a writ petition filed by J. Vanitha, a Home Science graduate, whose application for the post of Office Assistant in the CJM’s court was rejected by an order passed on July 26 on the ground that she had crossed the age limit of 32 years fixed for candidates belonging to the Most Backward Class category. Though the writ petitioner questioned the logic behind the rejection of her application when the recruitment notification had specifically stated that there was no age limit for degree holders, the counsel for the CJM said that such a clause was included in the notification by inadvertence and hence that could not be taken advantage of by the writ petitioner to stake a claim for the post without reference to age restrictions.

Similarly, contesting another writ petition filed by P. Meena (38), whose application for the post of Office Assistant had also been rejected on the ground of age, the counsel representing the CJM said that the post of Office Assistant fell under the Tamil Nadu Basic Service Rules, which, read along with Government Orders passed in October 1993 and May 2002 made it clear that the age limit for Backward Class and Most Backward Class was only 32 years.

After recording his submissions, the Division Bench dismissed both the writ petitions stating: “No doubt that in the impugned advertisement there is no age limit prescribed for the candidates who passed out Plus Two and degree. However, it is to be pointed out at this juncture that the advertisement is merely an offer to participate in the selection process, whereas the selection and recruitment would be governed by the statutes.”

Since the petitioners were overaged at the time of applications, they could not claim any right to be considered for the post, the Bench held.