



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: **25.03.2022**

CORAM:

WEB COPY

**THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM**

**W.P (MD)No.4395 of 2022**

**and**

**W.M.P (MD)No.3704 of 2022**

K.Murugesan

:Petitioner

.vs.

1.Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation,  
Rep by its Principle Secretary,  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai-09.

2.Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation,  
(Kumbakonam) Limited,  
Rep by its Managing Director,  
Kumbakonam Region,  
27, Railway Station New Road,  
Kumbakonam-612 001,  
Tanjavur District.

3.Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation  
(Kumbakonam) Limited,  
Rep by its General Manager,  
Kumbakonam Region,  
27, Railway Station New Road,  
Kumbakonam-612 001,  
Tanjavur District.

4.Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation  
(Kumbakonam) Limited,  
Rep by its Assistant Manager,  
(Employees & Administration)  
27, Railway Station New Road,  
Kumbakonam-612 001,  
Tanjavur District.

: Respondents

**PRAYER:** Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the entire records relating to the impugned letter issued by the 4<sup>th</sup> respondent in Ka.No.591/Neer-8/TaNaAPoKa (Ku)/2021 dated 06.11.2021 and quash the same and consequently, direct the respondents to disburse the Monitory benefits such as



Gratuity, provident fund, leave salary, bonus and all other benefits which the petitioner is entitled within a stipulated time as that may be fixed by this Court.

For Petitioner :Mr.A.Geroge Stephen Kanikkairaj  
For R1 :Mr.N.Santhosh Kumar  
Additional Government Pleader  
For R2 to R4 :Mr.P.Balasubramaniam

WEB COPY

**O R D E R**

The learned counsel for the petitioner made a submission that the petitioner has already divorced his wife and based on the decree of divorce, he seeks removal of the name of his wife from the Service Record as nominee.

2.However, the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the first respondent made a submission that no such decree of divorce has been produced by the petitioner.

3.Therefore, the said statement, in this regard, is insufficient to consider the claim of the writ petitioner. However, it is left open to the petitioner to produce all the relevant documents to the authority for consideration and only if the petitioner can able to prove that he is the legally wedded husband, who had already divorced his wife.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

// True Copy //

/ /2022

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Ns

To

1.The Principle Secretary,  
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation,  
Fort St. George,  
Chennai-09.

+1 CC to M/s.P.BALASUBRAMANIAN, Advocate ( SR-14947[F] dated 28/03/2022 )

**W.P(MD)No.4395 of 2022**

**and**

**W.M.P(MD)No.3704 of 2022**

**25.03.2022**

RK(04/04/2022) 2P 3C