IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 07.01.2016

Coram:

The Honourable Mr.SANJAY KISHAN KAUL, CHIEF JUSTICE
and
The Honourable Mrs.Justice PUSHPA SATHYANARAYANA

W.P.No.392 of 2016

Satta Panchayat Iyakkam (SPI)
represented by its President,
No.31, South West Boag Road,
T.Nagar, Chennai 600 017. .. Petitioner

Versus

1.The Chief Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu
Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009.

2.The Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009.

3.The Principal Secretary and
Commissioner of Revenue Administration,
Chepauk, Chennai 600 005.

4.The Secretary and Department of Personnel
and Administrative Reforms,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009. ..Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issue of a writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 and 2 to take appropriate disciplinary action against the erring village Administrative Officers and thier superior officers for violating the order of the Hon'ble Court of Judicature at Madras in W.P.No.7922 of 2011 dated 16.06.2011.

For Petitioner ::: Mr.D.Asenthamani
For Respondents ::: Mr.S.T.S.Murthy
Government Pleader
assisted by
Mr.V.R.Kamalanathan AGP
Mr.V.Shanmugasundar, GA.

WEB COPY

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

O R D E R

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

The grievance of the petitioner is that the directions passed by the High Court on 16.06.2011 in W.P.No.7922 of 2011 qua the discharge of duties by the Village Administrative Officers or Doctors and their non-residing in the village are not being implemented and on a survey, the petitioner found that not even a single out of 56 such officers surveyed stayed in the duty village, but stayed at a distance ranging from 5 to 50 kilometers.

2. In this behalf, the petitioner association made a representation dated 20.12.2014 which remained unanswered as usual.

3.We are not aware as to whether on the compliant being made, the Government carried out any verification, and if so, the results thereon.

4. We, thus, call upon the third respondent to get a proper verification done and find out if the allegations made by the petitioner are correct or not, and thereafter, pass a speaking order within a maximum period of three months from the date of receipt of the order. If the grievance of the petitioner survives, naturally the petitioner is at liberty to approach the court.

5. Needless to say that if the allegations of the petitioner are found to be correct, the consequential disciplinary action shall follow.

The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of. No costs.

-s/d-
Assistant Registrar(CSV)
dt:27/01/2016

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

ksr
To
1.The Chief Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu
Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009.

WEB COPY

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

2.The Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009.

3.The Principal Secretary and
Commissioner of Revenue Administration,
Chepauk, Chennai 600 005.

4.The Secretary and Department of Personnel
and Administrative Reforms,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.

+1 cc to Mr.D.A.Senthamani Advocate sr.1674
+1 cc to Government Pleader sr.1416

W.P.No.392 of 2016

lrs(co)
aa28/01/2016

WEB COPY

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