

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.08.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.22961 of 2004
and
W.P.M.P.No.27772 of 2004

V.Muruganantham

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Special Officer,
No.NK-1114, Dharapuram Agricultural
Producers Co-op. Marketing Society Ltd
Chinna Kadai Veedhi,
Dharapuram Taluk,
Erode District.

... Respondent

Prayer:

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari calling for the entire records relating to the impugned orders of suspension of service of the petitioner passed by the respondent in his proceedings No.37/2003-2004/A-1, dated 13.10.2003 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : M/s.C.Prakasam

For Respondent : Mr.V.Babu

सत्यमेव जयते
O R D E R

The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking issuance of Writ of Certiorari calling for the entire records of the proceedings of the respondent dated 13.10.2003 and to quash the same.

2.The petitioner while he was working as Sales Man in respondent Bank committed irregularities in the Public Distribution System for which he was placed under suspension by the respondent, Special Officer vide order dated 13.10.2003. That order is challenged in this writ petition.

3.A Larger Bench of this Court in its decision reported in 2006 (4) CTC 689 (K.Marappan Vs. The Deputy Registrar of Co-

operative Societies, Namakkal), has decided whether writ will lie against a Co-operative Society and has held as follows:

"21. From the above discussion, the following propositions emerge:-

(i) If a particular co-operative society can be characterised as a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution (applying the tests evolved by the Supreme Court in that behalf), it would also be 'an authority' within the meaning and for the purpose of Article 226 of the Constitution. In such a situation, an order passed by a society in violation of the bye-laws can be corrected by way of writ petition;

(ii) Applying the tests in *Ajay Hasia* it is held that a co-operative society carrying on banking business cannot be termed as an instrumentality of the State within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution;

(iii) Even if a society cannot be characterised as a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution, a Writ would lie against it to enforce a statutory public duty cast upon the society. In such a case, it is unnecessary to go into the question whether the society is being treated as a 'person' or 'an authority' within the meaning of Article 226 of the Constitution and what is material is the nature of the statutory duty placed upon it and the Court will enforce such statutory public duty. Although it is not easy to define what a public function or public duty is, it can reasonably said that such functions are similar to or closely related to those performable by the State in its sovereign capacity.

(iv) A society, which is not a 'State' would not normally be amenable to the writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution, but in certain circumstances, a writ may issue to such private bodies or persons as there may be statutory provisions which need to be complied with by all concerned including societies. If they violate such statutory provisions a writ would be issued for compliance of those provisions.

(v) Where a Special Officer is appointed in respect of a co-operative society which

cannot be characterised as a 'State' a writ would lie when the case falls under Clauses (iii) and (iv) above.

(vi) The bye-laws made by a co-operative society registered under the Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1983 do not have the force of law. Hence, where a society cannot be characterised as a 'State', the service conditions of its employees governed by its bye-laws cannot be enforced through a writ petition.

(vii) In the absence of special circumstances, the Court will not ordinarily exercise power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India when the Act provides for an alternative remedy.

(viii) The decision in M.Thanikkachalam v. Madhuranthagam Agricultural Co-operative Society, 2000 (4) CTC 556 is no longer good law, in view of the decision of the seven-Judge Bench of the Supreme Court in Pradeep Kumar Biswas case and the other decisions referred to here before."

4. As per the decision of the Larger Bench of this Court reported in the decision cited supra, writ petition is not maintainable against the Societies. Hence, this writ petition is dismissed. No costs. However, it is open to the petitioner to work out the remedy in the manner known to law. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS VI)

//True Copy//

uma
To

Sub Assistant Registrar

The Special Officer,
No.NK-1114, Dharapuram Agricultural
Producers Co-op. Marketing Society Ltd
Chinna Kadai Veedhi,
Dharapuram Taluk, Erode District.

+lcc to Mr.Venkataswamy Babu, Advocate, S.R.No.60329

W.P.No.22961 of 2004 and
W.P.M.P.No.27772 of 2004

SV(CO)
CA(13/09/2017)