



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.08.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE KRISHNASWAMY GOVINDARAJAN

W.P.No.26661 of 2015

and

M.P.No.1 of 2015

M.Manavalan

..Petitioner(s)

Vs.

1. The Chairman cum Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.
2. The Chief Engineer (Administration),
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.
3. The Superintending Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records in respect of the impugned order in Ku.No./Me.Po./Se.Mi.Pa.Va./Va./Ni.Pi.2/U.4/O.No.160/2009 dated 01.06.2009 passed by the 3rd respondent and subsequently rejection of appeal order in proceeding Ku.No.013824/610/Nir.A./Aa.Pirivu/Udhavi 2/13 dated 21.11.2013 passed by the 2nd respondent and the rejection of mercy plea vide proceeding Vaariya Nilai Aanai (Neerantharam) Chairman cum Managing Director dated 15.04.2015 passed by the 1st respondent and quash the same.



For Petitioner(s)

: Mr.P.Wesley Isaac

WEB COPY

For Respondent(s)

: Mr.K.Purushothaman, Standing Counsel

ORDER

This Writ petition has been filed seeking the following relief:-

“to call for the records in respect of the impugned order in Ku.No./Me.Po./Se.Mi.Pa.Va./Va./Ni.Pi.2/U.4/ O.No.160/2009 dated 01.06.2009 passed by the 3rd respondent and subsequently rejection of appeal order in proceeding Ku.No.013824/610/Nir.A./Aa.Pirivu/Udhavi 2/13 dated 21.11.2013 passed by the 2nd respondent and the rejection of mercy plea vide proceeding Vaariya Nilai Aanai (Neerantharam) Chairman cum Managing Director dated 15.04.2015 passed by the 1st respondent and quash the same.”

2. The brief facts of the case are as follows:-

2.1 The petitioner was employed as a Foreman, Grade-I, at the Minjur West Station. While in service, the petitioner was placed under suspension, *vide* proceedings dated 19.06.2006, on the allegation that he had unauthorizedly extended an agricultural service connection to a pump-set owned by one Ananda Naidu, by using old materials with the assistance of contract labourers and outsiders, without obtaining the mandatory prior permission from higher officials. Subsequently, the petitioner's suspension was revoked, *vide*



proceedings dated 23.08.2006, and he was transferred and posted to the Vyasarpadi Division.

WEB COPY

2.2 In such circumstances, after a lapse of about two years, disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the petitioner on the very same set of allegations. Upon completion of the departmental enquiry, the Enquiry Officer submitted a report holding that the charges levelled against the petitioner stood proved. Consequent upon the enquiry report, the 3rd respondent, *vide* proceedings dated 01.06.2009, imposed a punishment of stoppage of the petitioner's next increment for a period of six months without cumulative effect.

2.3 Aggrieved by the said punishment, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the 2nd respondent and the appellate authority, *vide* order dated 21.11.2013, rejected the appeal solely on the ground of delay. Thereafter, the petitioner moved a mercy petition dated 06.01.2014 before the 1st respondent, which also came to be rejected, *vide* order dated 15.04.2015. Challenging the primary punishment order as well as the subsequent orders of rejection, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of the present Writ Petition.

3. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side and perused the materials available on record.

4. Upon a careful perusal of the materials placed before this Court, particularly the explanation submitted by the delinquent employee, this Court



finds that the petitioner failed to tender any plausible explanation to rebut the charges levelled against him. Furthermore, during the course of the departmental enquiry, the petitioner failed to establish his innocence or disprove the allegations.

5. The main charge against the petitioner is that, while functioning as a Foreman under the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, he misused his official position to provide an agricultural service connection to the said Ananda Naidu by deploying old materials without administrative approval. It is neither the case of the petitioner that the service connection extended to the beneficiary was authorized by any order of the Board, nor is there any material on record to show that the said Ananda Naidu was legally allotted a service connection by the competent authority.

6. The petitioner was the Foreman in authority over the area in question, making him the sole person responsible for managing and overseeing the service connections. The unauthorized enjoyment of the service connection by the beneficiary is directly attributable to the petitioner's omissions and commissions.

7. Furthermore, considering the gravity of the charges, the punishment of stoppage of increment for six months without cumulative effect is just and



reasonable and thereby, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned orders.

WEB COPY

8. For the reasons aforesaid, this Writ Petition stands dismissed. No costs.

Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

19.08.2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

skt

To:

1. The Chairman cum Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.

2. The Chief Engineer (Administration),
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.

3. The Superintending Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Electricity Board,
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai – 600 002.



WEB COPY

W.P.No.26661 of 2



KRISHNASWAMY GOVINDARAJAN, J.

skt

W.P.No.26661 of 2015
and
M.P.No.1 of 2015

19.08.2026