

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20.09.2016

CORAM :

The Hon'ble MR.SANJAY KISHAN KAUL, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

The Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE R.MAHADEVAN

W.P. No.33643 of 2016  
(W.P. No. SR 109841 of 2016)

R.Harikrishnan ... Petitioner

-vs-

1.The State of Tamil Nadu,  
Rep. By its Chief Secretary,  
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,  
Mayiladuthurai, Nagapattinam District. ... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issue of Writ of Mandamus to direct respondent No.1 to conclude the proceedings initiated by respondent No.2 against the Village Administrative Officers under Rule 17(b) of the Tamilnadu Civil Service (Clarification, Control and Appeal) Rule as per the instructions issued by the Special Commissioner and Secretary to Government in Letter (KU) No.1118/Per-II/87 dated 22.12.87, within a time frame as this Hon'ble Court deems fit.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Asenthamani  
For Respondents : Mr.M.K.Subramanian,  
Govt. Pleader

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by The Hon'ble Chief Justice)

The petition styled as a public interest litigation is filed by the petitioner, who claims to be a farmer, for a direction to the first respondent to conclude the proceedings initiated by the second respondent against the Village Administrative Officers under Rule 17(b) of the Tamil Nadu Civil Service (Clarification, Control and Appeal) Rules, as per instructions issued by the Special Commissioner dated 22.12.1987 within a time frame to be fixed by the Court.

2.In respect of the controversy raised, we asked the learned counsel for the petitioner as to what concerns the petitioner specifically had with the enquiry in question against the Village Administrative Officers. We do not really find any satisfactory answer other than the submission that being a villager, he was affected by the disbursements made by the Village Administrative Officers and the enquiry pertains to the same.

3.We are not inclined to entertain this public interest litigation, but do believe that if such an enquiry is pending, the second respondent must expeditiously conclude this enquiry since the allegation appears to be in respect of public funds. The enquiry should be concluded preferably within a period of four (4) months from the date of receipt of the order.

4.Writ petition is dismissed with the aforesaid observations. No costs.

Sd/-  
Assistant Registrar(V)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

sra

To

1.The Chief Secretary,  
State of Tamil Nadu,  
Secretariat, Chennai-9.

2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,  
Mayiladuthurai, Nagapattinam District.

W.P.No.33643 of 2016

TRM(CO)  
EU 04.10.16

WEB COPY