IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30.06.2015

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE T.RAJA

W.P.No.19013 of 2015
and M.P.Nos.1 & 2 of 2015

K.Arjunan

[Petitioner]

Vs

1 The Principal Secretary
Rural Development & Panchayat Raj
Secretariat Chennai-9

2 The Collector
Kanchipuram District Collectorate Campus
Kanchipuram

3 The Additional Director
(Panchayats/Audit Village Panchayats)
Kanchipuram

4 The Block Development
Officer Kattankolathur Panchayat Union
Chengalpattu Taluk

5 The Thasildar
Taluk Office Chengalpattu

[Respondents]

This Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of a Writ of Certiorari to call for the records in Na.Ka.No.3848/2012/A.8/Vu.Ii (Vu) dated 9.11.2013 passed by the 2nd respondent and quash the same.

For petitioner Mr.K.Alayappan
For respondents Mr.A.Kumar, SGP (R1 TO 3 & 5)
Mr.K.V.Dhanapalan (R4)

WEB COPY

O R D E R

Heard Mr.K.Alayappan, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr.A.Kumar, learned Special Government Pleader for respondents 1 to 3 and R5 and Mr.K.V.Dhanapalan, learned counsel for R4 and with their consent, the main writ petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2. This writ petition has been filed by K.Arjunan, challenging the show cause notice dated 09.11.2013, issued by the Collector, Kanchipuram District, with a delay of two and half years on the ground that all the elected ward members have supported his case. The petitioner being an elected President of Thiruvadisoolam Panchayat Board was called upon to show cause as to why action should not be taken against him for various allegations.

3. The show cause notice dated 09.11.2013 was issued against the petitioner calling upon him to submit his detailed explanation as to why all the charges should be dropped. After two and half years, he cannot come to this Court. Hence, this Court is not inclined to entertain the writ petition on the following limited grounds:-

> Firstly, the show cause notice was issued almost 2 1/2 years ago.
>
> Secondly, the petitioner has to approach the District Collector, to consider his explanation, if already given.

Therefore, this Court is not in a position to consider the contentions putforth by the learned counsel for the petitioner. It is for the petitioner to convince the District Collector.

4. In view of the above, the writ petition fails and the same is dismissed. No costs. Connected miscellaneous petitions are also dismissed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

True Copy

Sub Assistant Registrar

rg

To
1 The Principal Secretary
Rural Development & Panchayat Raj
Secretariat Chennai-9

2 The Collector
Kanchipuram District Collectorate Campus
Kanchipuram

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

3 The Additional Director
(Panchayats/Audit Village Panchayats)
Kanchipuram

4 The Block Development
Officer Kattankolathur Panchayat Union
Chengalpattu Taluk

5 The Thasildar
Taluk Office Chengalpattu.

1 cc to Mr.K.Alayappan , Advocate Sr.No.32067
1 cc to Government Pleader.Sr.No.32979

W.P.No.19013 of 2015

kv(co)
pmk.13.7.2015

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/