



WEB COPY



W.P.NO.19045 OF 2026

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS**

**DATED: 07.08.2026**

**CORAM**

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM  
AND  
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR**

**W.P.NO.19045 OF 2026**

K.Sathya

... Petitioner

**-VS-**

1.The Registrar General  
High Court of Madras  
Chennai – 600 104.

2.The Principal District Judge  
Tiruvarur District.

3.The Subordinate Judge  
Mannargudi,  
Tiruvarur District.

4.The District Munsif cum  
Judicial Magistrate  
Valangaiman,  
Tiruvarur District.

5.The District Munsif cum  
Judicial Magistrate  
Needamangalam,  
Tiruvarur District.

... Respondents



W.P.NO.19045 OF 2026

**PRAYER:** Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the impugned inquiry report of the third respondent in D.P.No.10/2023 dated 23.08.2024, Final Order dated 07.01.2025 vide Order: A.No.27/AW.II/2025 and Review Order dated 12.06.2025 vide A.No.363/AW.II/2025 both passed by the second respondent, quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to regularize the petitioner's service from the date of joining i.e., 16.10.2021 with all consequential attendant benefits.

For Petitioner : Ms.U.K.Jeeva Dharshini  
For Respondents : Mr.S.Giridharan

### **ORDER**

**(Order of the Court was made by S.M.Subramaniam, J.)**

The writ petitioner was appointed as an Office Assistant in the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Court, Valangaiman. Departmental disciplinary proceedings were initiated, charge memo was issued and after conducting an enquiry, by following the procedures and by affording opportunity to the writ petitioner, final order in the departmental disciplinary proceedings was passed by the Principal District Judge, Tiruvarur, vide Proceedings dated 07.01.2025 imposing the punishment of withholding of future increment for one year without cumulative effect.



W.P.NO.19045 OF 2026

2.Ms.U.K.Jeeva Dharshini, learned counsel for the writ petitioner would strenuously contend that the punishment imposed is not in accordance with law and the procedures followed by the authorities are in violation of rules of natural justice. However, the learned counsel would submit that the petitioner has not preferred the statutory appeal, as contemplated under the Service Rules. An appeal would lie before the Registrar General, Madras High Court.

3.Exhausting the appeal remedy is of paramount importance, since the Appellate Authority would be in a position to appreciate the factual findings made by the original authority, with reference to the records available. Therefore, the importance and benefit of the statutory appeal insofar as an aggrieved person is concerned, it is to be protected.

4.In view of the above facts and circumstances, the writ petitioner is at liberty to prefer an appeal before the appellate authority within a period of thirty (30) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. On receipt of any such appeal from the writ petitioner, the appellate authority shall register the appeal without reference to the period of limitation, if any, and decide the matter on merits and in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible.



W.P.NO.19045 OF 2026

5. With these directions, the writ petition stands disposed of.

However, there shall be no order as to costs.

[S.M.S., J.]

[N.S., J.]

07.08.2026

Index : Yes / No  
Speaking Order : Yes / No  
Neutral Citation : Yes / No  
TK

To

1. The Registrar General  
High Court of Madras  
Chennai – 600 104.
2. The Principal District Judge  
Tiruvarur District.
3. The Subordinate Judge  
Mannargudi, Tiruvarur District.
4. The District Munsif cum  
Judicial Magistrate  
Valangaiman, Tiruvarur District.
5. The District Munsif cum  
Judicial Magistrate  
Needamangalam,  
Tiruvarur District.



WEB COPY



W.P.NO.19045 OF 2026

**S.M.SUBRAMANIAM, J.**

**AND**

**N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.**

TK

**W.P.NO.19045 OF 2026**

**07.08.2026**

*Page 5 of 5*