



W.P.(MD) No.16301 of 2026

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 21.07.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR

W.P.(MD) No.16301 of 2026

and

W.M.P.(MD) Nos.12143 & 15157 of 2026

S.Renukadevi

... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The Director
Horticulture and Plantation Crops
Chepauk, Chennai-5

2.The Deputy Director
Horticulture and Plantation Crops
Thallakulam, Madurai

3.Santhanakirshnan

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of certiorari calling for the records relating to the proceedings of the first respondent made in Samu.Aa.No.Apape/1/8028/2026, dated 02.06.2026 and quash the same.



W.P.(MD) No.16301 of 2026

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Murali

For Respondents : Mrs.K.Porkodi
Counsel for Govt. of Tamil Nadu for R1 & R2
No appearance for R3

ORDER

The petitioner, while working as Superintendent in the office of the second respondent, the impugned proceedings, dated 02.06.2026, came to be issued by the first respondent transferring the petitioner from the office of the second respondent to the office of the Deputy Director, Horticulture and Plantation Crops, Pudukkottai, while accommodating the third respondent herein in the post of the Superintendent in the office of the second respondent herein.

2. The case of the petitioner is that she was promoted to the post of Superintendent on 28.04.2023 and was transferred to Ooty and after a short period of three months, again she was transferred to Ramnad in the month of July, 2023. It was thereafter, on 04.07.2024, the petitioner was transferred to the office of the second respondent and she has been working in the office of the second respondent from 04.07.2024 for the past two years.



W.P.(MD) No.16301 of 2026

WEB COPY

While so, the impugned proceedings came to be issued by the first respondent transferring the petitioner from the office of the second respondent to the office of the Deputy Director, Horticulture and Plantation Crops, Pudukkottai, and accommodating the third respondent in the place of the petitioner in the office of the second respondent.

3. Challenging the said proceedings, the petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present writ petition contending that the impugned transfer order has been passed at the instance of the third respondent and basing upon the request of the third respondent only, with a view to accommodate him in the office of the second respondent, the petitioner is disturbed. Learned counsel for the petitioner further contends that in case if there is any administrative ground to fill up the post of Superintendent in the Office of the Deputy Director, Horticulture and Plantation Crops, Pudukkottai, the third respondent could have been placed there directly without disturbing the petitioner from the office of the second respondent. He further submits that the impugned proceedings makes a reference to the request made by the third respondent on 09.04.2026 and only pursuant to the request made by the third respondent, the petitioner is transferred from the office of the second respondent without there being any valid ground.



W.P.(MD) No.16301 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. This Court, while entertaining this writ petition, *vide* order dated 12.06.2026, granted interim stay of the operation of the impugned proceedings.

5. In spite of service of notice, third respondent has not chosen to enter appearance to contest the matter.

6. Respondents 1 & 2 have filed their counter-affidavit along with a writ miscellaneous petition seeking vacation of the interim order granted by this Court.

7. A perusal of the counter-affidavit filed by the respondents 1 & 2 would disclose that the respondents 1 & 2 have simply chosen to deny the allegations made by the petitioner in the affidavit filed in support of this writ petition, including the allegation that it is only at the instance of the third respondent, the impugned proceedings came to be issued. Though it is repeatedly stated that the impugned transfer has been effected only on administrative grounds, the respondents 1 & 2 failed to explain as to why there was a reference to the application dated 09.04.2026 submitted by the



W.P.(MD) No.16301 of 2026

petitioner. The respondents 1 & 2 also maintained absolute silence on the application of the third respondent in the counter-affidavit filed by them. If at all there is any other administrative ground, the respondents 1 & 2 would have mentioned the exact reason as to why the petitioner is sought to be disturbed even before she completing three years of service in the office of the second respondent.

8. Thus, from the silence maintained by the respondents 1 & 2 in their counter-affidavit and their failure to explain as to why there was a reference to the application submitted by the third respondent and the third respondent is sought to be accommodated in the place of the petitioner, this Court has no other option except to draw an inference that it is only at the instance of the third respondent and to do a favour to him, the petitioner herein is sought to be transferred from the office of the second respondent even before she completing three years of service.

9. Even otherwise, from the facts of the case on hand, it is also noticed that since the date of promotion of the petitioner to the post of Superintendent, it is the fourth transfer of the petitioner and frequent transfers are always deprecated by the Government as well as this Court time



W.P.(MD) No.16301 of 2026

WEB COPY

and again. Notwithstanding the guidelines issued by the Government in G.O.Ms.No.10, Personnel and Administrative Reforms (Per.S) Department, dated 07.01.1994, the first respondent has issued the impugned proceedings. Having made a reference to the said Government Order in the impugned proceedings, in violation of the said Government Order, the petitioner is sought to be transferred even before she completing three years of service in the office of the second respondent at Madurai.

10. In the light of the above, this Court is thoroughly convinced that the impugned proceedings has been issued not on the administrative grounds, but only to accommodate the third respondent herein in the place of the petitioner herein and therefore, on that ground, the same is liable to be quashed.

11. Accordingly, the impugned proceedings dated 02.06.2026, issued by the first respondent, is hereby quashed. The interim order dated 12.06.2026 granted by this Court and was extended thereafter is hereby made absolute. Consequently, W.M.P.(MD) No.15157 of 2026 is hereby dismissed.



W.P.(MD) No.16301 of 2026

WEB COPY

12. Accordingly, this writ petition is allowed. No costs.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

21.07.2026

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

krk

To:

- 1.The Director,
Horticulture and Plantation Crops,
Chepauk, Chennai-5.
- 2.The Deputy Director,
Horticulture and Plantation Crops,
Thallakulam, Madurai.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.16301 of 2026

MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR, J.

krk

W.P.(MD) No.16301 of 2026
and
W.M.P.(MD) Nos.12143 & 15157 of
2026

21.07.2026