

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED 19.01.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.VAIDYANATHAN

W.P.Nos.6241 & 6243 of 2020
and
W.M.P.Nos.7351 to 7354 of 2020
(Heard through VC)

B.Annamuthu ... Petitioner in W.P.No.6241/2020
S.Karunakaran ... Petitioner in W.P.No.6243/2020

-vs-

The District Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing
Corporation (TASMAC),
No.1, Katpadi Road,
Vellore District - 4. ... Respondent in both W.Ps.

Prayer: Petitions filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records from the respondent in impugned order dated 22.02.2020, bearing ref.Che.Mu.Na.Ka.No.A2/11063/C.V/2019 and quash the same as illegal, arbitrary, without jurisdiction.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Stalin
in both W.Ps.

For Respondent : Mr.P.Arumugarajan
in both W.Ps.

सत्यमेव जयते

COMMON ORDER

WEB COPY

These writ petitions have been filed, challenging the order of the respondent dated 22.02.2020, made in Ref.Che.Mu.Na.Ka.No.A2/11063/C.V/2019, by which, the petitioners were relieved from service on temporary basis.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing on both sides and perused the materials available on record.

3. According to the petitioners, the respondent issued four charges against the petitioners on 15.11.2019, stating that there was a deficit in collection amount of Rs.30,590/-

and that there was an anonymous bag, which contained 42 liquor bottles and cash for a sum of Rs.2,000/-. Consequent to the charges, they submitted their explanation on 22.11.2019, by countering the charges levelled against them. But, on 22.02.2020, the respondent has passed the impugned order by temporarily discharging the petitioners from service. Aggrieved by the said order, the present writ petitions have been filed.

4. Upon consideration of the submissions made on either side, it is seen that the main relief sought for by the petitioners is to interfere with their suspension and the same cannot be gone into in these Writ Petitions at this stage, as it is for the respondent to consider reinstatement of the petitioners, bearing in mind the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the recent decision in *Ajay Kumar Choudhary vs. Union of India* through its Secretary and another, reported in 2015 (7) SCC 291, and *State of TN vs. Promod Kumar IPS and another*, reported in AIR 2018 SC 4060, by posting them in a non-sensitive post, provided there are no legal impediments. It is needless to mention here that disposal of these writ petitions will not preclude the respondent from issuing charge memo, if not already issued and after taking explanation, a domestic enquiry may be conducted and imposition of punishment may be awarded, if the charges are established. In similar circumstances, this Court has elaborately dealt with the issue in *W.P.No.13 of 2021 (V.Mohanraj vs. The Secretary and two others)*, and passed a detailed order on 06.01.2021. For the sake of convenience, the relevant Paragraph Nos.6 to 10 are extracted hereunder:

"6. Considering the facts and circumstances of this case, this Court is not going to direct the respondents to promote the petitioner to the post of Inspector by including him in the panel and it is for the respondents to consider the same. It is needless to mention that if any departmental proceedings have been commenced or initiated, it is open to the respondents to proceed with the same so as to bring the proceedings to a logical end, de hors pendency of the criminal case, as both criminal proceedings as well as departmental proceedings can go on simultaneously and the criminal case should be proved beyond reasonable doubt by adducing oral and documentary evidence, whereas charges in the departmental proceedings should be established on the basis of preponderance of probabilities. If Criminal Proceedings are not initiated or concluded within one year from the date of FIR, there is no hindrance on the part of the employer to proceed with the departmental proceedings on day to-day basis and bring the issue to a logical end at the

earliest point of time and the employee will have to participate in the departmental proceedings and shall not attempt to adopt dilatory tactics.

7. In this regard, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Stanzen Toyotetsu India Private Limited vs. Girish v. and others, reported in (2014) 3 SCC 636, has clearly laid down a dictum as under:

"19. In the circumstances and taking into consideration all aspects mentioned above as also keeping in view the fact that all the three Courts below have exercised their discretion in favour of staying the on-going disciplinary proceedings, we do not consider it fit to vacate the said order straightaway. Interests of justice would, in our opinion, be sufficiently served if we direct the Court dealing with the criminal charges against the respondents to conclude the proceedings as expeditiously as possible but in any case within a period of one year from the date of this order. We hope and trust that the Trial Court will take effective steps to ensure that the witnesses are served, appear and are examined. The Court may for that purpose adjourn the case for no more than a fortnight every time an adjournment is necessary. We also expect the accused in the criminal case to co-operate with the trial Court for an early completion of the proceedings. We say so because experience has shown that trials often linger on for a long time on account of non-availability of the defense lawyers to cross-examine the witnesses or on account of adjournments sought by them on the flimsiest of the grounds. All that needs to be avoided. In case, however, the trial is not completed within the period of one year from the date of this order, despite the steps which the Trial Court has been directed to take the disciplinary proceedings initiated against the respondents shall be resumed and concluded by the Inquiry Officer concerned. The impugned orders shall in that case stand vacated upon expiry of the period of one year from the date of the order.

20. In the result, we allow these appeals but only in part and to the extent

indicated above. The parties are left to bear their own costs."

8. For the purpose of brevity, this Court makes it very clear that if any criminal proceedings have been initiated after commencement of the departmental proceedings, the one year time limit mentioned supra will not apply to those cases and the departmental proceedings shall go on uninterruptedly. Invariably, the offenders, who have committed grave offences, are being acquitted on the ground of benefit of doubt, owing to missing link in the chain of events and are trying to get back the entire backwages and for those persons, employment itself is a lottery.

9. In the present case on hand, even according to the petitioner, a charge memo has been issued as early as on 18.12.2015 and in case any departmental proceedings had already commenced, the same shall be proceeded on a day to-day basis without adjourning the matter beyond seven working days at any point of time and brought to a logical conclusion at the earliest. The petitioner shall co-operate for early attainment of the proceedings.

10. With the above observation, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs."

5. As far as the payment of subsistence allowance is concerned, it shall be considered and paid, if it is payable in terms of the provisions applicable to the respondent.

6. Accordingly, these writ petitions are disposed of and the respondent shall take a decision in the light of the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the judgment of this Court dated 06.01.2020 (especially Paragraph No.6). Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

rsi

To

The District Manager,

Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation (TASMAC),

No.1, Katpadi Road,Vellore District - 4.

+2ccs to Mr.V.Stalin , Advocate SR.No. 2357 and 2358

W.P.Nos.6241 & 6243 of 2020

and W.M.P.Nos.7351 to 7354 of 2020

A SR(11/03/2021)