

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated : 04.01.2016

Coram :

The Hon'ble Mr.Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

W.P.No.38818 of 2015  
and M.P.No.1 of 2015

K.Kumar

... Petitioner

vs

1.The Senior Regional Manager,  
Tamil Nadu State Marketing  
Corporation Ltd., (TASMAC)  
Salem Region, 56 Brindhavan Road,  
Fairlands, Salem - 16.

2.The District Manager,  
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd.,  
(TASMAC), TANCOF Complex,  
No.52, Anna Salai,  
Thiruvannamalai.

.... Respondents

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issue of writ of certiorarified mandamus calling for the records of order of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent bearing proceedings in Na.Ka.R.V.2/1920/2014 dated 08.04.2015 which is confirmed by 1<sup>st</sup> respondent in Se.Mu.No.3539/2015/A dated 19.09.2015 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to reinstate the petitioner into service, with continuity of service and all attendant benefits.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Sasindran  
For Respondent : Mr.S.Muthuraj

O R D E R

By consent, this writ petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.

2. The case of the petitioner is that while he was working as a salesman in Shop No.9202 at Arani in Thiruvannamalai District, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent issued a suspension order dated 16.08.2015 to the petitioner relieving him from the services. The charges against the petitioner is that while conducting surprise checking in the shop, it was found out that the petitioner mixed water with brandy. After relieving the

petitioner from the services, by order dated 01.10.2014, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent appointed an enquiry officer and the enquiry officer, after considering the materials submitted during the enquiry, submitted a report on 22.12.2014 stating that the charges against the petitioner are not proved.

3. It is further stated that the respondent issued 2<sup>nd</sup> show cause notice dated 11.03.2015 for which the petitioner had submitted his explanation on 19.03.2015. However, the petitioner was dismissed from the services vide termination order dated 08.04.2015. Thereafter, the petitioner preferred appeal before the Appellate Authority which was dismissed on 19.09.2015. Hence, the petitioner is before this court by way of this writ petition.

4. Heard Mr.K.Sasindran, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr.S.Muthuraj, learned counsel who accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

5. The impugned order is challenged mainly on the ground that the disciplinary authority, who has differed from the finding of the enquiry officer, without issuing a notice for deferring his view, has passed the impugned order. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner is ready to give up his claim with regard to backwages.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the respondents submitted that the issue involved in this case is already covered by the decision of this court made in WP No.22092 of 2015. The relevant portion of the said order is usefully extracted as follows -

5. No doubt that when the earlier enquiry officer held that the charges were not proved, the disciplinary authority could very well differ with the findings of the enquiry officer and could hear the delinquent on such findings. But, in the instant case, no such procedure was followed and on the other hand, the respondent in gross violation of the procedures established by law, appointed another enquiry officer who ultimately held that the charges were proved. In my considered view, such procedure is illegal and thus, the order of dismissal of the petitioner from service, based on such finding, is liable to be interfered with.

6. Yet another infirmity noticed is that when the inspection was carried out by the respondent, he could not have acted as disciplinary authority in view of the judgment of this court in W.P.No.28066 of 2014 dated 05.03.2015 (A.Sreenivasan and others v. The District Manager, TASMAL, Tiruvallur District). On this ground also the impugned order requires interference at the hands of this court.

7. At this juncture, the learned counsel for the petitioner brought to the notice of this court an order dated 13.07.2015 made in W.P.No.20745 of 2015 and would submit that taking into account the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, more particularly, the nature of allegations, in this case also, a direction could be issued for reinstatement of the petitioner.

8. In the normal course, I could have permitted the respondent to proceed with the departmental action by curing the defects pointed out supra. But, in the instant case, I do not want to adopt such a course, since the learned counsel for the petitioner, during the course of this writ petition, on instructions from the petitioner, submitted that the petitioner is prepared to give up the claim with regard to back wages.

9. In the result, this writ petition is disposed of and the impugned order is set aside and the respondent is directed to reinstate the petitioner in service with continuity of service and attendant benefits, but without back wages. No costs. Consequently connected MP is closed.

7. Following the above said order, the writ petition is allowed with a direction to the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent to reinstate the petitioner into service, within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order with continuity of service and attendant benefits, but without back wages. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Sd/-  
Assistant Registrar(V)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

rgr

To

1.The Senior Regional Manager,  
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd., (TASMAC)  
Salem Region, 56 Brindhavan Road,  
Fairlands, Salem - 16.

2.The District Manager,  
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd.,  
(TASMAC), TANCOF Complex,  
No.52, Anna Salai,  
Thiruvannamalai.

+ 1 cc to M/s. K. Sasindran, Advocate SR.463

W.P.No.38818 of 2015

RSK(CO)  
EU 01.02.16



WEB COPY