

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 17.03.2015

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K.SASIDHARAN

W.P.No.6281 of 2015 and
M.P.Nos.1 and 2 of 2015

T.Suganthi

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. Inspector General of Police,
Tamilnadu Police Academy, Chennai - 600 048.

2. The Enquiry Officer-cum-Addl. Supdt. of Police,
Tamilnadu Police Academy,
Chennai - 600 048.

...Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of certiorarified mandamus, to call for the records of the 2nd respondent and quash the charge memorandum dated 13.04.2009 vide RC No.T1/822/2009 P.R.No.02/2009 issued by the first respondent against the petitioner and consequently direct the first respondent to regularise the services of the petitioner together with all consequential benefits.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Ravi Anantha Padmanaban

For Respondents: Mr.P.Sanjay Gandhi
Addl.Govt.Pleader

O R D E R

The petitioner challenges the charge memo dated 13.04.2009, whereby and where under, the first respondent initiated disciplinary proceedings against her.

2. The petitioner filed a writ petition earlier in W.P.No.10018 of 2009 challenging the very same charge memo dated 13.04.2009. The writ petition was dismissed on merits by order dated 18.11.2010. Subsequently, the petitioner filed another writ petition in W.P.No.26289 of 2011, directing the respondents to furnish relevant documents and permit her to cross-examine the witnesses. The said writ petition was also dismissed on 15.11.2011 with an observation that the intention of the petitioner is to drag on the disciplinary proceedings initiated against her pursuant to the charge memo dated 13.04.2009.

3. The petitioner without disclosing the factum of dismissal of the earlier two writ petitions has come up with the present writ petition to quash the very same charge memo. The affidavit filed in

support of the writ petition does not contain any indication with regard to the dismissal of two writ petitions filed earlier. The petitioner suppressing the factum of dismissal of the earlier writ petitions has filed this writ petition alleging that she was not given documents and that the Enquiry Officer was biased. The petitioner on account of her suppression of material particulars with regard to previous litigation is not entitled for equitable relief. I am therefore of the view that the writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

4. In the result, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

True Copy

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. Inspector General of Police,
Tamilnadu Police Academy, Chennai - 600 048.

2. The Enquiry Officer-cum-Addl. Supdt. of Police,
Tamilnadu Police Academy,
Chennai - 600 048.

+1 cc to M/s.K.Ravi Anantha Padmanaban, Advocate, SR.14907

+1 cc to Government Pleader, SR.15134.

ala(co)
krd 31/3

सत्यमेव जयते

W.P.No.6281 of 2015

WEB COPY