

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 25.02.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.15050 of 2018

C.Kalaiselvan

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Chairman, TANGEDCO,
NPKRR Maaligai
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai - 600 002.

2. The Executive engineer/O&M,
Egmore/CEDC/Central, Chennai - 600 012

3. The Superintending Engineer/O&M,
CEDC/Central, Chennai - 600 034. .. Respondents

PRAYER: This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issue of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for records and quashing the impugned order of suspension issued by the 2nd respondent vide Memo No.328/Adm./A1/F.Suspension/2013 dated 06.07.2013 suspending the petitioner with effect from 06.07.2013 F.N. and consequently direct the respondents to reinstate the petitioner in the rank of Assistant Executive Engineer within time frame.

For Petitioner : M/s.K.Ravi Anatha Padmanaban

For Respondent : Mr.P.R.Dhilip kumar,
Standing Counsel

O R D E R

The writ petitioner was placed under suspension, on account of the arrest by the Director of Vigilance and Anti Corruption, R.A.Puram, Chennai - 28, at the office of the Assistant Engineer, TANGEDCO for the demand and acceptance of bribe amount Rs. 20,000/- for processing and to provide additional Service Connection to the complainant's residence,

2. Undoubtedly, the allegations against the writ petitioner are certainly serious warranting an enquiry, as well as the criminal case is also to be faced by the writ petitioner. Undoubtedly, all these proceedings initiated against the writ petitioner must reach its logical conclusion. However, placing under suspension for an unspecified period is not desirable.

3. Prolonged suspension is bad in law. On initiation of disciplinary proceedings, undoubtedly an employee shall be placed under suspension by the Competent Authority. However, the authorities competent must ensure that the departmental disciplinary proceedings initiated against the employees are concluded within a reasonable period of time. In the event of an enormous delay in concluding the departmental disciplinary proceedings, then the authorities competent must review the order of suspension for its revocation. If it is not possible for the authorities to conclude the departmental disciplinary proceedings, then the order of suspension can be revoked and the employees shall be reinstated into service and post in any one of the non-sensitive post till the conclusion of the departmental disciplinary proceedings as well as the criminal case registered against him. Contrarily, an employee cannot be kept under suspension for years together without any progress in departmental disciplinary proceedings.

4. Undoubtedly, disposal of the criminal case may take long years by the Competent Court of law. However, there is no bar for the disciplinary authorities to continue the departmental disciplinary proceedings even during the pendency of the criminal case. In other words, mere pendency of the criminal case is not a bar for the continuance of the departmental disciplinary proceedings. If the files, materials and other records are available with the authorities competent, then they are at liberty to continue the departmental disciplinary proceedings, conclude the same and pass final orders pending disposal of the criminal case.

5. If an employee after departmental disciplinary proceedings is convicted by the Competent Court of Law, then further actions shall be taken or the earlier orders shall be reviewed for issuing appropriate orders based on the conviction. There is no impediment for the authorities on initiation of fresh proceedings, if a public servant is convicted in criminal case by the competent Court of Law. Considering all these aspects, the disciplinary authorities shall continue the departmental disciplinary proceedings and pass final orders pending disposal of the criminal case. This being the legal principles settled by the Constitutional Courts, the authorities need not keep an employee under suspension for an unspecified period. Keeping an employee under suspension for long years and

paying subsistence allowance for an unspecified period is causing financial loss to the State exchequer. Payment of subsistence allowance without extracting work is a financial loss to the State exchequer. Thus, the authorities must be vigilant and review the order of suspension periodically and if there is no impediment, conclude the disciplinary proceedings and pass final orders.

6. In the case on hand, the order of suspension was issued long back and the writ petitioner is under continuous suspension without any progress in the departmental disciplinary proceedings as well as the criminal case. This being the factum of the case, this Court is of an opinion that there is no useful purpose would be served in keeping the writ petitioner under suspension for further period and accordingly the following orders are passed:

(i) The impugned order of suspension passed by the 2nd respondent in his Memo No.328/Adm./A1/F.Suspension/2013 dated 06.07.2013 is quashed.

(ii) The respondents are directed to reinstate the petitioner in service.

(iii) The respondents are directed to post the writ petitioner in any one of the non sensitive post till the conclusion of the departmental disciplinary proceedings as well as the criminal case registered against the writ petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition stands allowed. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

सत्यमेव जयते
Sub Assistant Registrar

Kmm/pns

To

1. The Chairman, TANGEDCO,
NPKRR Maaligai
No.144, Anna Salai, Chennai - 600 002.

WEB COPY

2. The Executive engineer/O&M,
Egmore/CEDC/Central, Chennai - 600 012

3. The Superintending Engineer/O&M,
CEDC/Central, Chennai - 600 034.

+lcc to M/s.K.Ravi Anatha Padmanaban, Advocate sr.no.17253
+lcc to Mr.P.R.Dhilip kumar, Advocate sr.no.17317

W.P.No.15050 of 2018

cj(co)
nr 28/03/2019



WEB COPY