BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

RESERVED ON : 21.01.2022
DELIVERED ON : 01.11.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

W.P.(MD)No.15670 of 2017
and
W.M.P.(MD)No.12382 of 2017

K.Kannan ... Petitioner

vs

1.The Commissioner HR and CE,
HR and CE Department,
Chennai – 34.

2.The Joint Commissioner,
HR and CE,
Admin Department,
Madurai – 03.

3.The Joint Commissioner,
Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Meenakshi Sundareshwarar Thirukoil,
Madurai – 625 001. ... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to impugned order passed by the first respondent vide his proceedings Ref: common order D.Dis.R.P.No.329/2016 and 103/2017/D2 dated 19.05.2017 reversing the order passed by the second respondent in A.P.No.4/2016 and confirming the order of the third respondent vide his proceedings in pro.Rc.No. 2827/2015/B1 dated 30.04.2016, quash the same and consequently, direct the respondent to reinstate the petitioner granting continuance of service with all monitory attendant service benefits.

For Petitioner	:	Mr. V. Prakash, Senior Counsel. For M/s. Niranjan S. Kumar
For R-1 and R-2	:	Mr. R. Ragavendran, Government Advocate.
For R-3	:	Mr. S. Ravindran, Senior Counsel. For Mr. V.R. Shanmuganathan, Standing Counsel.

*****

ORDER

This writ petition is filed for quashing the order, dated 19.05.2017, whereby it reversed the order dated 26.10.2016 passed by the second respondent, but confirmed the order dated 30.04.2016 of the third respondent and consequently, direct the respondent to reinstate the petitioner granting continuity of service with all monetary and attendant benefits.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner was appointed as daily wage employee on temporary basis in the year 1996 and subsequently, appointed as Record Clerk in the third respondent Temple on 27.08.1996. Thereafter, promoted as Junior Assistant on 19.02.2010, then promoted as Assistant on 16.11.2012 and then promoted as Senior Assistant on 11.12.2013 and has served 19 years in the third respondent Temple.

3. The third respondent vide proceedings in Na.Ka.No.290 / 2011/A1, dated 13.03.2015, directed the Superintendent to inspect the Godown, Stock register and to inspect all kinds of Prasadhams, which are manufactured inside the Temple, to check the quality and quantity and to submit a report. The contention of the petitioner is that the Superintendent has inspected the entire Prasadham preparing place and submitted a report that the quantity and quality are perfectly in order. However, the petitioner has sent a communication dated 14.03.2015 to

the third respondent that certain raw materials that are given to manufacture the Prasadhams are not in good quality and all the eight items mentioned in the letter has to be replaced in order to make Prasadhams in good quality. The third respondent had issued an order, dated 19.03.2015, directing the petitioner to surrender the defective materials to the Temple store and to get new stock. Thereafter, once again the third respondent issued an order, dated 19.04.2015, directing the petitioner to assist Chithirai festival and also coordinate with the Prasadham Stall. On 09.05.2015, the third respondent had issued another standing instruction to all the Department Heads to submit a report regularly mentioning about the stocks purchased, used for manufacturing, sales report and the remaining balance stocks.

4. The petitioner further contended that since he has written so many communications pointing about the defective stocks and other irregularities in purchasing the stocks, the third respondent along with the Superintendent and the Store Keeper were having vengeance and showing it in the day-to-day work. On 14.07.2015, a surprise inspection was conducted by the third respondent and the petitioner, who was in-charge of sales, was asked to leave the Prasadham

manufacturing place and the doors were closed. After the inspection, the petitioner came to know from the kitchen staffs that the third respondent has purposefully asked the cook to reduce the weight in Thenkuzhal (Murukku) and also on other Prasadhams. Surprisingly, the third respondent had issued a Charge Memo on 21.07.2015 and the petitioner was temporarily suspended on the same day. The charges are that the petitioner has reduced the manufacturing weight of Prasadhams produced in the Temple and has not accounted the excess manufacture of Prasadhams due to reduction of weight. The petitioner has created loss to the Temple in sales counter and the petitioner have not executed his work properly and violated the work rules and regulations and caused defame to the Temple by not manufacturing the Prasadhams in proper quality and quantity.

5. After suspension, the third respondent has directed the Cashier-cum-Writer to assume charge of the Prasadham manufacturing and sales. On 25.07.2015, the petitioner submitted a detailed explanation and requested to accept his explanation and to reinstate the petitioner into service. On 28.07.2015 and 29.07.2015, the third respondent once again sent a communication directing

the petitioner to surrender the stocks which are in petitioner's custody. On 14.08.2015, the petitioner surrendered the entire stock in the presence of the Temple authorities and HR and CE Officials and also reduced the same into writing.

6. On 14.09.2015, the third respondent had issued another order for additional charges to the Charge Memo. On 21.09.2015, the petitioner was directed to appear for an enquiry. On 22.09.2015, the petitioner appeared for the enquiry and sort 19 Documents / Registers in order to submit his explanation for the additional charges. The petitioner has also submitted a letter, dated 25.09.2015 and sought additional time of 10 days for submitting the explanation. On 17.10.2015, the petitioner submitted a detailed explanation to the additional charges. On 26.03.2016, the third respondent sent a communication to explain to the charges raised in the Audit Objection. There are two parallel proceedings one initiated by the third respondent after conducting inspection and the second proceedings were initiated at the instance of audit objections. The third respondent passed a final order on 30.04.2016 and imposed the punishment of dismissal from service. The petitioner has preferred an appeal in A.P.No.4 of 2016

and the third respondent has filed a counter on 28.07.2016.

7. In the meanwhile, the petitioner sought some more details under the RTI for the charges raised under audit objection and the third respondent directed the petitioner to submit a reply to the audit objection. Since the petitioner was dismissed from service on 30.04.2016 and for the very same charges the show cause notice was issued for the audit objection. Aggrieved over the same, the petitioner has filed a writ petition in W.P.(MD)No.16513 of 2016 and this Court granted an interim order of stay. The respondents have filed a counter and the petitioner has filed a rejoinder affidavit also. The second respondent after conducting an elaborate proceeding in the Appeal in A.P.No.4 of 2016, passed final orders, dated 26.10.2016, wherein, the second respondent has held that certain crucial charges are not proved and the punishment was reduced from dismissal from service to reduction of post to two lower grades and also held that there shall not be promotion till the retirement. Aggrieved over the same, the third respondent has filed a Revision Petition before the first respondent and the first respondent granted interim stay on 16.12.2016.

8. The petitioner has also filed a Revision Petition is R.P.No.103 of 2017 as against the second respondent's order for the aggrieved portion alone. The first respondent heard both the appeals and passed final orders on 19.05.2017, dismissing the petitioner's revision application but allowed the revision application filed by the third respondent and set aside the order passed by the second respondent and confirmed the order of the third respondent, dismissing the petitioner from service by common order. Aggrieved over the order, the petitioner has preferred this writ petition.

9. The third respondent has filed a counter affidavit and an additional counter affidavit stating that the writ petition is not maintainable since alternative remedy is available under Section 114 of Tamilnadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act, 1959. The third respondent Temple is having various Schemes and there was a direction to the staffs to prepare a budget one month well in advance for the purchase of relevant materials. Thereafter, the store keeper should find out and ascertain of the quality of the materials purchased and then the materials should be delivered to the concerned staffs by them for preparing Prasadhams. If the materials were not up to the standard, the same should be

returned to the supplier. The materials supplied by the worshippers during "Thulabaram" to be received by the Ulthurai Superintendent and after entering into the respective registers the same should be stored in the General Store. Here also if the materials are good then it will be utilized for preparing Prasadhams otherwise it will be utilized for cow, elephant feeding etc. Any deviation would be taken seriously and action would be initiated. If the Prasadhams are not up to the standard, suitable action would be proceeded with against all the staff concerned. Accordingly vide proceedings in Na. Ka. No. 290 / 2011 / A1 dated 11.08.2014 strict order was issued to maintain good quality materials for preparing temple Prasadhams with requisite weight. In another communication, dated 13.03.2015, the Joint Commissioner has reiterated the contents of the guidelines dated 11.08.2014, otherwise, suitable action would be taken against all the concerned including Ulthurai Superintendent, Superintendent in-charge of immovable properties, Ulthurai Manager, Peshkar and Writer. During personal inspection of Joint Commissioner on 14.07.2015, in Prasadhams section, in 24 trays, 100 laddus were kept in each tray, of which, laddus were kept in 12 trays, samples were taken and after finding that the laddus were lesser in weight and also it was not upto the standard and the price in the different weight has also not been accounted for, hence the respondents inferred that the price for the difference in the wight of laddus were not accounted for and was misappropriated by the writ petitioner. Likewise in respect of preparation of other Prasadhams also deficiencies in quality have been noticed.

10. Thereafter, based on the spot inspection and *prima facie* evidence, the matter was placed before the Fit Person. Pursuant to the resolution in Resolution No.2129, dated 21.07.2015 of the Fit Person, the writ petitioner was placed under suspension and he was called to submit his explanation. The writ petitioner submitted his explanation on 25.07.2015. But the petitioner did not come forward to handover the charges, hence vide order, dated 28.07.2015, he was directed to handover the charges to one Murugan, Junior Assistant. Even thereafter, the petitioner did not hand over the charge. Hence the third respondent, directed the other staff to submit actual report in Prasadhams section for the period from 01.07.2014 to 28.07.2015 relating to the purchase of the materials, stock-in-trade, preparation of Prasadhams and sale of Prasadhams etc. On the basis of the report dated 24.08.2015 submitted by the concerned staffs, other discrepancies made by

the writ petitioner came to light and based on the said report, vide Resolution No. 2194 of 2015, dated 11.09.2015, it was decided to frame additional charges. Thereafter additional charges were framed vide proceedings in Se.Mu.Nata.Na. Ka.No.2827/2015/A11 dated 14.09.2015. The petitioner submitted an explanation on 17.10.2015, since the explanation was not satisfactory the respondents decided to conduct an enquiry and issued enquiry notice directing to appear for enquiry on 13.11.2015. With regard to the irregularities in Prasadhams section for the fasli year 1424 from 01.07.2014 to 28.07.2015, the Deputy Chief Audit Officer HR&CE Department, Madurai carried out for ascertaining the exact monetary loss and in the preliminary report, dated 27.11.2015, it was found that more than one and half times firewood has been used in the current fasli year. Based on the report, a fresh enquiry has been conducted on 28.12.2015 by granting an opportunity to the petitioner to submit his explanation. The writ petitioner appeared and submitted his explanation. After perusing all the materials on record and the explanation submitted by the petitioner, the third respondent submitted his enquiry report to the Fit Person on 31.03.2016, contending that all the charges framed against the writ petitioner were proved. Then the writ petitioner was directed to appear before the Fit Person on 21.04.2016 to offer his explanation to the Fit Person. On that day the petitioner appeared and reiterated his explanation and prayed to exculpation from the charges. The fit person passed a Resolution No.2530, dated 30.04.2016. Based on the resolution, the petitioner was dismissed from service by observing that the petitioner has acted against the welfare of the third respondent temple and caused monetary loss by misusing his position for his personal gain by misappropriating Temple funds.

11. Aggrieved over the dismissal order the petitioner preferred an appeal in A.P. No. 4 of 2015 under section 56(2) of the Act before the 2nd respondent, but the 2nd respondent without adverting to the serious charge of misappropriation of Temple funds, without adverting to the fact while working as Senior Assistant, several irregularities have been committed by the petitioner including fabricating false records, tampering official records had passed an order allowing the appeal in part and reduced the punishment. Aggrieved over the same, the second respondent has preferred a Revision Petition in R.P. No.329/2016/D2 under section 21 of the Act before the 1st respondent and the petitioner has also preferred Revision Petition in R.P. No. 103 of 2017. After detailed hearing the 1st

respondent had allowed the revision petition filed by the temple but dismissed the revision petition filed by the writ petitioner vide order dated 19.05.2017, which is challenged in the present writ petition.

.

12. Heard the Learned Mr. V. Prakash, Senior Counsel for M/s. Niranjan S. Kumar appearing for the petitioner, Mr. R. Ragavendran, the Learned Government Advocate appearing for respondents 1 and 2 and Mr. S. Ravindran, Senior Counsel, for Mr. V.R. Shanmuganathan, Standing Counsel for the 3rd respondent and perused the records.

13. The respondents contended that the petitioner has an alternative remedy under Section 114 of Tamil Nadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act and not under Article 226 of the Constitution. Since this case was admitted in the year 2017 at this stage this Court is not inclined to direct the petitioner to file a petition under section 114. Hence the case is heard on merits.

14. The petitioner has raised various grounds against the order passed by the third respondent and first respondent.

15. The first contention of the petitioner is that the third respondent being an Executive Officer of the Temple, he himself conducted the enquiry and no separate Enquiry Officer was appointed. The proper authority to conduct the enquiry is a fit person under Section 56(1) of the Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments. Hence the dismissal order passed by the third respondent and the order of the first respondent confirming it is null and void and hence both the impugned orders are liable to be set aside. However, this plea was refuted by the respondent and submitted that it is false to state that the third respondent being an Executive Officer of the Temple, he himself conducted an enquiry and no separate Enquiry Officer was appointed to enquire the charges. The third respondent conducted an enquiry against the writ petitioner only as per the resolutions passed by the Competent authority, vide resolution, dated 21.07.2015 and 11.09.2015 and the Competent authority under Section 56 (1) is the "Fit Person" and the "Fit Person" has initiated the proceedings. The petitioner has not objected at the first

instance and having subjected himself to the jurisdiction of the Enquiry Officer, he is estopped from raising such plea at the later point of time. It was also submitted that section 56 (1) of Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act, 1959, has been strictly followed in the instant case and infact all the decisions, i.e. to issue suspension order, to frame charges, to hold enquiry, to impose punishment were taken by the Fit Person and the third respondent has given effect to the decision of the Fit Person and conducted the enquiry and carried out the instructions. The third respondent has implemented the decision as per Rule 14 of the Functioning of the Board of Trustees Rules issued under Section 116 read with Sections 47, 48 ,49 of the Tamil Nadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act,1959. Hence, the enquiry is within the jurisdiction of the Fit Person and the enquiry is legally sustainable in law. On perusal of the resolutions, it is seen that the Fit Person had come to conclusion based on the preliminary reports to conduct further enquiry. Thereafter the 3rd respondent was directed to conduct further enquiry. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that the contention that the 3rd respondent has conducted the preliminary enquiry and also the domestic enquiry is incorrect and the plea of the petitioner is rejected.

16. The next contention of the petitioner is that on 13.03.2015, the third respondent purposefully asked the petitioner to wait outside the stall and asked the kitchen staff Ramachandran to weigh the laddus and Thenkuzhals and the said Ramachandran has given a statement that the third respondent purposefully asked him to make the Thenkuzhals and other Prasadhams in lesser weight than it was usually prepared and hence the act of the third respondent is to victimize the petitioner. The respondents submitted since the allegation against the petitioner is misappropriation, fabricated and tampered official records, hence the respondents deemed it fit to conduct enquiry in the absence of the petitioner to ascertain the truth. Moreover, based on single day evidence the enquiry was not conducted, based on the further evidence, records, other connected documents and enquiry from other connected persons the enquiry was conducted. Hence the allegation is absolutely incorrect. On considering the rival submissions, this Court is of the considered opinion that generally, suspension of the delinquent would be ordered in order to conduct and collect evidence, and prevent the delinquent from erasing the evidence and in such circumstances the employer have every right to suspend

the delinquent. In the present case the respondents have conducted the enquiry by preventing the petitioner to enter the kitchen. Moreover, the petitioner cannot direct the respondents to conduct in a particular manner. Hence, this Court is of the considered opinion that there is no victimization as alleged.

17. The next contention of the petitioner is that the co-delinquent namely Mr. Jayaprakash, who is a store keeper was also tried along with the petitioner, but, he was given a minimum punishment of stoppage of increment for three years with cumulative effect. Another co-delinquent, Ganesan, was imposed to the punishment of stoppage of increment for one year and both the co-delinquents were still working in the Temple. Hence the petitioner claims that the punishment of dismissal from service is harsh and disproportionate punishment and prays to allow the writ petition. This contention is refuted by the respondents and stated that the co-delinquent, Ganeshan, is only concerned with sale and he has nothing to do with the reduction of weight. The co-delinquent, Jeyaprakash duty is to get orders from the in-charge and to supply the materials as required and he has nothing to do with misappropriation, fabrication of documents and other things.

Hence, the minor punishment was imposed to them. The allegation against the writ petitioner is he is fully in-charge of Prasadham stall, he has misused his power, committed misappropriation in the sale of Prasadhams, fabricated records, tampered official records and caused huge monetary loss to the Temple, hence, he was dismissed from service. The Learned Senior Advocate submitted that in case of misappropriation, the Honourable High Court has held in 2005(1)MLJ 621, the amount may be small or large, but the act of misappropriation is relevant. And further submitted that in the absence of procedural irregularities or illegality the scope of interference by High Court under Article 226 is very limited in the departmental proceedings as held by the Apex Court in 2015 (2) SCC 610. Hence, the petitioner is liable to be dismissed. On perusal of records, it is seen that the relevant evidence was perused, the petitioner was granted adequate opportunity to peruse the records and there is no violation of principles of natural justice. As rightly pointed out the charges against the petitioner were serious than the other co-delinquent and the petitioner cannot compare with the other co-delinquents. Hence this Court is of the concerned opinion that the punishment is proportionate.

18. The next plea of the petitioner is that the Audit Objection shows that there is a deficit of Rs.35,000/- (Rupees Three Thirty Five Thousand only) in sales account but the third respondent or the Auditing authority failed to consider the quantity of 3500 numbers of Thenkuzhal sent to State Legislative Assembly canteen. The contention of the respondent is that it is false to state that the deficit of Rs.35,000/- (Rupees Thirty Five Thousand only) relates to Thenkuzhal which was supplied to the State Legislative Assembly. Infact every year, one day, the third respondent would send Thenkuzhal to the State Legislative Assembly for which separate materials for preparation would be supplied and it is nothing to do with the Prasadhams stall sale account. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that this plea is liable to be rejected.

19. The respondents submitted that the petitioner while preparing Prasadhams with a lesser weight, the entire sundries have not been accounted in the Temple accounts and has prepared the budget beyond the requirement by putting up false indent with ulterior motive and has prepared fraudulent documents by colluding with tenderer, Ulthurai Superintendent and General Store

keeper as if firewood was bought from lorry to the tune of Rs.6,69,888/- (Rupees Six Lakh Sixty Thousand Eight Hundred and Eighty Eight only) and has cheated the Temple. Without procuring firewood, the petitioner has submitted a bill for Rs.92,016/- (Rupees Ninety Two Thousand and Sixteen only) and recommended for payment as if 12.78 tons of firewood is supplied with an intention to cheat the Temple. Without procuring requisite firewood and without reflecting it in the true accounts as if additional amount to the tune of Rs.1,99,080/- (Rupees One Lakh Ninety Nine Thousand and Eighty only) has been shown in the Temple accounts to cause financial loss. The entire stock of Pepper to the tune of 25.490 kilos stored has been swindled by the writ petitioner. While maintaining Prasadham section the stock-in-trade has not been properly accounted for. While preparing Prasadhams, 70% of the Prasadhams are of lesser weight, only small quantity of remaining sundries alone was accounted for, the petitioner has not accounted the value to the tune of Rs.3,60,700/- (Rupees Three Lakh Sixty Thousand and Seven Hundred only) and has swindled with the same.

20. The respondents further submitted in the additional counter affidavit

that the petitioner was in overall in-charge for the procurement and usage of large quantity of materials. On an average, every year procurement for making Prasadhams alone involves expenditure to the extent of Rs.1,05,73,023/-, Rs. 1,28,90,020/-, Rs.1,53,91,568/-. Rs.1,47,58,491/- and Rs.1,74,93,591/- for the fasli year 1421,1422,1423,1424 and 1425 respectively. On 14.07.2015, the Superintendent of the third respondent Temple has submitted a report bringing to the notice of the Administration about the irregularities. Thereafter, a charge sheet was issued on 21.07.2015. Thereafter, the petitioner submitted an explanation and he was allowed to verify the records. On 17.08.2015, the firewood supplier R.Sivamurthy was examined and the petitioner has cross-examined him. Thereafter, a charge sheet, dated 14.09.2015 was issued levelling eleven additional charges. On 05.10.2015, 06.10.2015 to 10.10.2015and 12.10.2015, the petitioner verified the records and thereafter the petitioner has submitted an explanation on 17.10.2015. In respect of charge sheet, dated 21.07.2015, and 14.09.2015, enquiry proceedings were held on 13.11.2015, 28.12.2015 and 31.12.2015. In the enquiry held on 13.11.2015, the petitioner stated that in respect of both the charge sheets, his explanation, dated 25.07.2015 and 17.10.2015 should be taken as his deposition and that he is not interested to examine anyone in respect of the charges. In the enquiry, held on 28.12.2015, the petitioner has stated additional expenditure and consumption of more materials and firewood was due to more preparation of Prasadhams. But the respondents submitted that the records are not tallying and hence the respondents have come to the conclusion that the petitioner has misappropriated. This Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner was granted sufficient opportunity and infact at each and every point of enquiry and before passing final orders, a separate notice was given to the petitioner and he had also submitted his written explanation. Moreover, as rightly pointed out by the respondents the petitioner was not interested to enquire anyone and prayed to accept the explanation dated 25.07.2015 and 17.10.2015 and the same shall be taken as his deposition. Hence, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is incorrect to state that the petitioner was not given proper opportunity and therefore the claim of the petitioner for remitting of the case does not arise and the plea of the petitioner to remit the case is rejected.

21. The next contention of the petitioner is he was not granted any

opportunity. The respondents submitted that the petitioner perused all the exhibits which were taken for the consideration by the Enquiry Officer. The documents maintained in the course of business transaction are the exhibits and which are within the knowledge of the petitioner. At the time of enquiry proceedings, at no point of time, the petitioner raised any grievance or prejudice to him. Moreover, a specific plea was raised by the respondents wherein the respondent submitted that the petitioner was not interested to enquire anyone and prayed to accept the explanation dated 25.07.2015 and 17.10.2015 and the same shall be taken as his deposition and hence, the plea that he was denied opportunity is false. Therefore, this Court is of the considered opinion that the enquiry was conducted in a fair and transparent way and the plea of violation of principles of natural justice is incorrect.

22. The next contention of the petitioner is that the second respondent while passing an order categorically stated that charges 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 10 have not been proved. But the first respondent without explaining why he has deferred from the appellate authority’s order, has passed the impugned order and

the same is illegal. On perusing the order of the first respondent, it has been held that when it was pointed out about shortage of firewood and shortage of pepper, the said items were replaced by the petitioner and it amounts to admission of the charges. Further it was held that the petitioner had tampered the records with intention to make fraudulent entries. Hence the first respondent has come to the conclusion that the petitioner was entrusted with a noble work of providing good quality and correct quantity of Prasadhams to the devotees, but the petitioner failed to do his duty with care and devotion which has resulted in damage of the temple name and thereafter confirmed the punishment of dismissal from service. This Court is of the considered opinion that since the charges are serious and as stated supra the grounds raised in this writ petition are not sustainable.

23. The next plea the petitioner has raised that the petitioner had put in 19 years of service, he was out of service for the past five years and has five years of service left and has a family to take care of. Therefore, to meet the ends of justice this Court is of the considered opinion that the punishment alone shall be modified from dismissal from service to compulsory retirement.

24. Therefore this Court is modifying the punishment as compulsory retirement and the official respondents are directed to implement the punishment and disburse the terminal benefits that is applicable to the petitioner. This order shall be implemented within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of the copy of the order. The writ petition is disposed of. No Costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

01.11.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes

jbr

To

1.The Commissioner HR and CE,
HR and CE Department,
Chennai – 34.

2.The Joint Commissioner,
HR and CE,
Admin Department,
Madurai – 03.

3.The Joint Commissioner,
Executive Officer,
Arulmigu Meenakshi Sundareshwarar Thirukoil,
Madurai – 625 001.

S.SRIMATHY, J

jbr

Order made in
W.P.(MD)No.15670 of 2017

01.11.2022