

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.09.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.9642 of 2015

T.Ramalingam

...Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Director,
Elementary Education Department,
College Road,
Chennai - 600 006.
- 2.The District Chief Education Officer,
Cuddalore District - 607 001.
- 3.The District Elementary Education Officer,
Cuddalore District - 607 001.
- 4.The Secretary,
Aided Elementary School,
Manadikuppam,
Neyveli Range, Panruti-TK,
Cuddalore District - 607 805.

5.Mrs.Kalachithra

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 3 to consider the representation dated 25.02.2015 made by the petitioner about the cheating committed by the fourth respondent herein for obtaining Rs.7,00,000/- as arrears amount.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sairaman
For R1 to R3 : Mr.S.Gunasekaran
Additional Government Pleader
For R4 : Ms.R.Gowri
For R5 : Mrs.Ritachandrasekar

O R D E R

The relief sought for in this writ petition though large in nature. The learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner made a submission that restricting the prayer by stating that it

is suffice if a direction is issued to consider the representation submitted by the writ petitioner on 25.02.2015.

2.However, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents 4 and 5 opposed the prayer by stating that the writ petition itself is filed only on personal vengeance and in order to deprive the fifth respondent from getting her service benefits in accordance with the rules. At the out set, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the 4th and 5th respondents states that the writ petitioner is a frequent complaint writer and he used to sent complaints frequently and unnecessarily in order to harass the officials as well as the fifth respondent.

3.May that it be, this Court has to strike out a balance between the claim made out by the writ petitioner as well as by the 4th and 5th respondents. However, the relief sought for now by the learned counsel for the writ petitioner is to consider the representation in order to find out the truth behind the statement made in the representation.

4.This being the factum represented before this Court and this Court is inclined to direct the first respondent to consider the representation submitted by the writ petitioner on 25.02.2015 and pass orders on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. While considering the representation, if necessary, the 4th and 5th respondents also may be given an opportunity to be heard before taking any decision.

5.Accordingly, the writ petition stands disposed of. However, there is no order as to costs.

s/d-

Assistant Registrar(J)

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

ah

To

1.The Director,
Elementary Education Department,
College Road,
Chennai - 600 006.

2.The District Chief Education Officer,
Cuddalore District - 607 001.

3.The District Elementary Education Officer,
Cuddalore District - 607 001.

4.The Secretary,
Aided Elementary School,
Manadikuppam,
Neyveli Range, Panruti-TK,
Cuddalore District - 607 805.

+lcc to Mr.S.Sairam,Advocate, SR.69353

+lcc to Government Pleader, SR.70094

W.P.No.9642 of 2015

CB(30/10/2017)



WEB COPY