



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9064 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 09.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Ms. JUSTICE P.T. ASHA

W.P.No. 9064 of 2026

&

W.M.P.Nos. 9782 & 10455 of 2026

G.Thulasi

...Petitioners

Vs.

1.The Deputy Inspector General of Police
Kancheepuram Range,
Kancheepuram.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police
Chengalpattu Sub-Division
Chengalpattu.

3.Tr.Sundararaj

...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Section 226 of the Constitution of India for issue of Writ of Mandamus, calling for the records of the 1st respondent in connection with the impugned order passed by him in PR.No. 15/2024 dated 12/11/2024 and quash the same.

1/11



W.P.No.9064 of 2

For Petitioner : Mr. K.Venkataramani
Senior Counsel

For Mr. M.Muthappan

For Respondents : Mr. R.U.Dinesh Raj Kumar
1 & 2 Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This writ petition is filed for the following relief:

“To call for the records of the 1st respondent in connection with the impugned order passed by him in PR.No. 15/2024 dated 12/11/2024 and quash the same.”

2. The petitioner was appointed to the post of Sub-Inspector of Police by direct recruitment conducted by the Tamil Nadu Uniformed Service Recruitment Board. The petitioner was working as Sub Inspector of Police in Uthiramerur Police Station, Kancheepuram at the relevant point of time.



W.P.No.9064 of 2

WEB COPY

3. The petitioner would submit that on 24.07.2024, a special team comprising of the Sub-Inspector of Police Tr.Suresh of Sivakanchi PS, Chandrasekar, PEW, Kancheepuram, J.Srinivasan, Sub-Inspector of Police, Magaral P.S., K.Ezhumalai, PC 661 of Kanchi Taluk PS, who were serving under the control of the Inspector of Police, Special Branch, Kancheepuram, conducted a surprise check in the Cheyyar River bed to prevent theft of sand and illegal transportation of liquors. The petitioner would submit that at around 2.30 AM in the morning, one Gopinath was found loitering in the river bed and when questioned he has stated that he is selling illicit liquor and also helping one Rajesh in the offence of theft of sand from Cheyyar river bed.

4. On the information furnished by him, the special team has arrested three persons, namely, Rajesh, Vinayagamurthy and Velmurugan, who have involved in theft of sand on 24.07.2024 and they claimed to be habitual offenders. The petitioner would submit that the accused who were arrested have told that they have committed theft of river sand with the knowledge of the police officials and they were



W.P.No.9064 of 2

giving mamool to the Sub-Inspector of Police. It was also alleged that the petitioner was receiving mamool from those persons and permitted them to commit the illegal transportation of the river sand from the Cheyyar river bed.

5. The petitioner would submit that following their arrest, a criminal case was registered in Cr.No.332 of 2024 on 24.07.2024 on the file of the Uthiramerur Police Station for offences under Sections 326, 302 (2) of BNS r/w 2(1) of the TNPPDL Act. The accused were remanded to judicial custody. Thereafter, based on their alleged statement that they were paying mamool to the police in order to allow the illegal smuggling of the sand from the river bed the petitioner was transferred to Tiruvallur District.

6. It is submitted that based on the above allegations, a preliminary enquiry was conducted by the 1st respondent and on his report, the petitioner has been issued with the impugned charge memo dated 12.11.2024 containing false and frivolous charges and also against another Police Constable Dillibabu in PR No.16 of 2024. In the



W.P.No.9064 of 2

meanwhile, the petitioner was also suspended from service in another disciplinary proceedings, which is initiated and pending against him in the Tiruvallur District.

7. The petitioner would submit that the charges against him are false and without any basis. Therefore, the petitioner is before this Court.

8. The main plank of the argument of the learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner was that the charge memo lacked clarity and was vague and therefore the same cannot be sustained.

9. The learned Additional Government Pleader submitted the one of the accused, namely, Rajesh, had given the following statement:

“கொஞ்ச நாள் எனக்கு கல்குவாரியில் எந்த
ஆடும் கிடைக்கவில்லை அதனால் எனக்கு
செலவுக்கு பணம் இல்லாமல் கஷ்டமா இருந்தது
என்னிடம் விநாகழித்தியும் வேல்முரகனும் அடிக்கடி



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9064 of 2

போனில ஃ பேசுவார்கள் ஃ நான ஃ அவர்களிடம்
பணம் ஃ இல்லாம கஷ்டமா இருக்கு என்று
சொன்னேன் கடந்த 20 நாட்களுக்கு முன்பு நாங்க
முனு பேரும் உத்திரமேரூரில் சந்தித்து ஒழுகரை
கிராமம் செய்யாறு ஆற்று படுகையில் மணலை
திருடி விற்கலாம் என்று பேசினோம் அப்போது
எங்களுக்கு தெரிந்த மதுபாட்டில் விற்று வந்த
கருவேப்பம்பூண்டியைச ஃ சேர்ந்த கோபி
என்பவரிடம் ஃ இதைபற்றி சொன்னதற்கு கோபி
எங்களிடம் ஃ கோலீஸ் ஃ ஸ்டேஷனுக்கு தகவல்
தெரியாமல் ஓட்டினால் மாட்டிக் கொள்வீர்கள் நான்
உங்களுக்கு உதவியாக இருக்கிறேன் எஸ் ஃ ஐ
மற்றும் ஃ ஞா ஒரு டில்லிபாபுவுக்கு தகவல்
சொல்லிட்டு ஓட்டுங்க என்று சொன்னார். அதன்படி
நாங்கள் ஃ அவர்களுக்கு தகவல் ஃ தெரிவித்து
கருவேப்பம்பூண்டி கோபிக்கு ரூ.3000/- ஊத்திரமேரூர்
போலீஸ் ஸ்டேஷன் ஞா துளசி சாருக்கு ரூ.10000/-



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9064 of 2

மும ஃ டில்லிபாப , சாருக்கு பணம ஃ ரூ5000/-

கொடுத்தோம். இது சம்மந்தமாக இன்று

24.07.2024 ந் தேதி இன்ஸ்பெக்டராகிய தாங்கள்

என்னை விசாரிக்க நான் மேற்படி விவரங்களை

சொன்னேன்/

10. The said Rajesh has clearly spoken about the fact that they have given illegal gratification to the petitioner herein. Based on this statement the charge memo has been issued. No doubt the same has to be proved.

11. The 1st respondent in his status report would submit that the charge memo had been issued based on the statement given by the said Rajesh. It is further stated that disciplinary proceeding has been initiated on the basis of the special report received from the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kancheepuram Sub-Division, to whom the said Rajesh given his statement. The report would further state that the petitioner had been summoned only for an oral enquiry and on none of



W.P.No.9064 of 2

the occasions had he appeared or turned up for the enquiry. The petitioner had been citing reasons for not attending the hearings.

WEB COPY

12. The report further states that the summon dated 17.02.2026 had been sent through Police messenger informing the petitioner if he fails to appear for an enquiry on 20.02.2026, an ex parte order would be passed. He was not available at his home and the same was informed over phone. He had informed the messenger that he would collect the summons in person on 19.02.2026. Once again, on 19.02.2026, the petitioner was not present in his house and when contacted he had informed that summons be served on his elder brother Parthasarathy and the same was also done as per his instructions. It is also stated that there are several complaints against the petitioner. Further, there is also a case against him pending before the Judicial Magistrate, Sriperumbudur, in CC.No.791 of 2025.

13. Heard the rival submissions, perused the affidavit, connected documents and report of the 1st respondent.



W.P.No.9064 of 2

WEB COPY

14. The petitioner is a Police Officer who is bound to maintain honesty and probity in discharge of his duty. The allegation if proved has to be seriously viewed taking note of the fact that the petitioner is a uniformed personnel. It is only a charge memo that has been issued and it is well open to the petitioner to submit his explanation and orders would be passed only after a detailed enquiry giving him a personal hearing to enable him to submit his documents and examine witnesses.

15. In these circumstances, I see no reason to quash the charge memo. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs.

09.03.2026

kan



W.P.No.9064 of 2

To

WEB COPY

1.The Deputy Inspector General of Police
Kancheepuram Range,
Kancheepuram.

2.The Deputy Superintendent of Police
Chengalpattu Sub-Division
Chengalpattu.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.9064 of 2

P.T. ASHA, J

kan

W.P.No.9064 of 2026

09.03.2026