



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Orders reserved on 01.02.2022

Orders delivered on 18.04.2023

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE **J.NISHA BANU**

W.P.Nos.6267 of 2013 & W.P.No.8648 of 2015

and

M.P.Nos.1 & 2 of 2013 and M.P.No.2 of 2015
and W.M.P.No.2381 of 2016

K.Chinnasamy

.. Petitioner in both the W.Ps.

Vs

1. The Joint Registrar of Coop. Societies,
Erode Region, Erode,
Erode District.

2. The Special Officer,
AA528 Vazhaithottam Primary Agricultural
Co.op. Credit Society, Vazhaithottam Post,
Sivagiri Via - 638 109,
Erode District.

..Respondents 1 & 2 in both the W.Ps.

3. The Deputy Registrar of Coop. Societies,
Erode Circle, Erode,
Erode District.

.. 3rd respondent in W.P.No.8645/2015



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

PRAYER in W.P.No.6267/2013: Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the entire records relating to the impugned orders passed by the 2nd respondent Society dated 31.03.2012, which was confirmed by the 1st respondent vide his proceedings in Na.Ka.3092/2012 Sa.Pa. dt.24.09.2012 and quash the same and consequently, direct the respondents to pass orders for posting the petitioner as an Assistant Secretary with all consequential service and monetary benefits w.e.f. 01.04.2012.

(Prayer amended vide order dated 13.12.2022 made in WMP.32602/2022 in W.P.6267/2013 by JNBJ)

PRAYER in W.P.No.8648/2015: Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the entire records relating to the impugned order passed by the 3rd respondent in her Proceedings No.Na.Ka.3017/2013 Tho.Vae.Sa.1 dated 10.02.2015 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to disburse the petitioner's pay scale on the basis of the basic pay of Rs.14,558/- per month to the petitioner.

For Petitioner in both : Mr.K.Premkumar
W.Ps.

For Respondents in both : Mr.T.Arunkumar,
W.Ps. Additional Govt.Pleader
for R1 & R3
Mr.L.P.Shanmugasundaram for
R2



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

COMMON ORDER

W.P.No.6267 of 2013 has been filed challenging the order of the 2nd respondent dated 31.03.2012, de-promoting the petitioner from the post of Assistant Secretary to Clerk and the order of the 1st respondent dated 24.09.2012, rejecting the revision filed by the petitioner and consequently, direct the respondents to pass orders for posting the petitioner as an Assistant Secretary with all consequential service and monetary benefits with effect from 01.04.2012.

W.P.No.8648 of 2015 has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 10.02.2015 passed by the 3rd respondent, directing the 2nd respondent not to revise the pay scale fixed for the petitioner and consequently, direct the respondents to disburse the petitioner's pay scale on the basis of the basic pay of Rs.14,558/- per month to the petitioner.

2. i) The case of the petitioner in brief is that the petitioner was initially appointed as Salesman in the 2nd respondent Society and thereafter, promoted as Clerk on 21.12.1990. He was further promoted as Senior Clerk on 23.11.1995 and subsequently, as Assistant Secretary on



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

28.11.1998. When the petitioner was working as such, the 2nd respondent issued charge memo dated 20.10.2011 framing three charges viz., i) deliberate disobedience, ii) behaved in a manner detrimental to the interest of the society and its members and iii) dereliction of duties and responsibilities assigned.

ii) For the aforesaid charges, the petitioner submitted his explanation on 08.11.2011 denying the charges. Domestic enquiry was conducted and during the last date of domestic enquiry i.e., on 06.02.2012, due to ill health, the petitioner was unable to participate after post lunch session and he submitted a leave letter to the enquiry officer, but the enquiry office closed the enquiry on 06.02.2012 and submitted his report on 21.02.2012 holding the three charges as proved.

iii) The 2nd respondent management issued show cause notice dated 05.03.2012 as to why the punishment of dismissal from service should not be imposed on the petitioner. The petitioner submitted his explanation. The 2nd respondent passed final order imposing punishment of reduction in ranks on the petitioner from the post of Assistant Secretary to the post of



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

Clerk by order dated 31.03.2012, which is challenged in W.P.No.6267/2013.

WEB COPY

Against the order of punishment of demotion, the petitioner preferred revision under section 153 of the Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1983 before the 1st respondent and the revisional authority confirmed the order of the disciplinary authority by dismissing the revision petition by order dated 24.09.2012 and the same is also challenged in W.P.No.6267/2013.

iv) When the above said writ petition is pending, 2nd respondent revised the salary from 14,558/- to 5250/-. The petitioner made several representations to the respondents. Thereafter, the 2nd respondent realised their mistake and passed a resolution in resolution Nos. 5 and 6 dated 29.01.2015, whereby decided to disburse the previous salary i.e., Rs.14,558/- as the petitioner's basis pay. But the 3rd respondent passed an order in proceedings dated 10.02.2015 directing the 2nd respondent not to revise the pay scale fixed for the petitioner. The same is challenged in W.P.No.8648/2015.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Additional



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

Government Advocate appearing for the 1st and 3rd respondents and the learned counsel appearing for the 2nd respondents.

4. i) Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that three charges have been framed as against the petitioner. The reasons for initiating charge No.1 are that as per the resolution No.4, dated 05.02.2011, the petitioner refused to join the post of cashier; as per resolution dated 01.02.2011, the petitioner refused to go for the jewel appraiser's course; and the petitioner did not attend the meeting held by the Supervisor of the District Central Coop. Bank at Sivagiri on 21.09.2011 at 4.00 a.m. as advised, which has caused strained relationship with the Central Bank.

ii) Learned counsel would further submit that for the above charges, the petitioner submitted his explanation on 08.11.2011. The petitioner was asked to look after the duties of Cashier which is lower rank than the post of Assistant Secretary. The then Special Officer and the Secretary colluded with each other and asked the petitioner to look over the cashier post by passing a resolution No.4 dated 05.02.2011, for which, the petitioner made a request before the 2nd respondent and explained that he cannot work in



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

lower rank and allow him to discharge the duties of Assistant Secretary post.

But the 2nd respondent neither rejected nor informed or insisted that the petitioner should take over the charge of cashier post. Thus, the petitioner did not commit any disobedience.

iii) Learned counsel would further submit that as per resolution dated 17.02.2011, the petitioner was asked to attend the Jewel Appraiser Training Course, but no written order has been issued to the petitioner and also in that resolution, the signature of the petitioner has not been obtained and therefore, without any written orders to the petitioner, the question of not undergoing the Jewel Appraiser Training Course does not arise. Further, for discharging the duties of Assistant Secretary, the jewel appraiser training is not at all required. But to take vengeance against the petitioner, the then Secretary and the then Special Officer of the 2nd respondent Society passed such a resolution, without communicating the same to the petitioner.

iv) Learned counsel would further submit that on 21.09.2011, the Special Officer asked the petitioner to bring the loan application forms to Erode, (since he was working at Circle Deputy Registrar's office there) for



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

giving his approval. Therefore, the petitioner left the 2nd respondent society office at about 12.45. PM, after recording in the tour register that the petitioner is leaving office to Erode to see the Special Officer and also to attend the pending work in IFFCOTOKIO Insurance office and the then Secretary of the 2nd respondent Society asked the petitioner to go to Sivagiri by 4 'O' Clock and attend the meeting to be held by the Supervisor. When the petitioner explained him about the order of the Special Officer, the then Secretary deliberately recorded in the Tour Register that the petitioner should return by 4. P.M. The Secretary has got more than 33 years of experience at the 2nd respondent society. He knew very well that the meeting to be held at Sivagiri by the Supervisor is an important meeting and if no representative from the society attends the meeting, it is likely to cause strained relationship between the society and the District Central Coop. Bank. Further, he could not also deny the fact that going to Sivagiri from Valaithottam and from Sivagiri to Erode and again, from Erode to Sivagiri, will take more than four hours, since the bus frequency will be less during lunch time. Therefore, as the Chief Executive of the Society, the then



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

Secretary of the 2nd respondent society ought to have spoken to the Special Officer and ought to have made alternate arrangements by sending some other officer/staff to Erode, so that the petitioner can attend the Sivagiri meeting. Otherwise, anticipating the required travel time, the time needed for going to the Circle Registrar's office and time required for the special officer for giving approval to the loan applications, ought to have sent some other representative to attend the meeting. The petitioner, being subordinate to the Special Officer and the Secretary, cannot refuse to obey the instructions of both. Therefore, the petitioner made sincere attempts to obey the order. He rushed from the Society to Sivagiri but he was unable to catch the earliest bus to Erode. He could reach the office of Circle Deputy Registrar only at 2.45 p.m. When the petitioner enquired about Special officer, he was asked by the officers to wait and he waited for over an hour and with much hesitation, when the petitioner contacted him, he informed that he was held up due to some urgent work and ordered the petitioner to come on the next day. In the meantime, the petitioner tried to contact the then Secretary, but the society's phone number was continuously engaged.



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

Therefore, he could not attend the meeting at Sivagiri, since he could not return from Erode, due to the reason beyond his control.

v) Learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that insofar as charge No.2 is concerned, the allegation is that without leave application, the petitioner absented from duty on 20.01.2011 and for which, the petitioner submitted his explanation stating that he availed leave on 19.01.2011 and on 20.01.2011, the Kodumudu Police, called the petitioner and his wife for an enquiry on the basis of the complaint lodged by the petitioner's wife against the Secretary of the 2nd respondent society and hence, the petitioner appeared before the said police station on 20.10.2011 and in that enquiry, the then Secretary and other 2nd respondent society officials were present and the whole day, the petitioner was detained at the police station itself and hence, he could not be able to attend the duty. Therefore, due to unavoidable circumstances and unforeseeable situation, the petitioner could not reach the office on 20.01.2011 and open the same and this fact was well known to the 2nd respondent society and its officer and they should have made alternative arrangements to open the office on



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

20.01.2011. Therefore, shifting the entire burden on the shoulders of the petitioner is incorrect and false.

vi) Learned counsel would further submit that without considering the explanation offered by the petitioner and without furnishing the copies of the relied documents, the 2nd respondent has appointed a domestic enquiry officer to conduct the domestic enquiry. The enquiry officer conducted enquiry on 30.12.2011, 19.01.2012, 04.02.2012 and 06.02.2012. The petitioner attended the enquiry and during the last date of domestic enquiry i.e., on 6.2.2012, due to ill health, he could not able to participate after post lunch session and therefore, he submitted leave letter to the enquiry officer. Recording the letter of the petitioner, the enquiry officer simply adjourned the enquiry to post lunch session of the same day i.e., on 6.2.2012. But the fact remains that no further enquiry was conducted during post lunch session on 06.02.2012 or on the subsequent dates and no notice was issued to the petitioner about the closure of the domestic enquiry. The enquiry was abruptly closed on 6.2.2012 and a report was submitted on 21.02.2012 holding all the three charges proved as against the petitioner.



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

vii) Learned counsel would further submit that the 2nd respondent issued show cause notice dated 05.03.2012 to the petitioner as to why the punishment of dismissal from service should not be imposed on the petitioner and in the notice itself, the 2nd respondent admitted that they have accepted the domestic enquiry officer's report in full. Therefore, it shows that for name sake, they have called for an explanation from the petitioner. The 2nd respondent had acted in vindictive manner to punish the petitioner. Thereafter, final order was passed imposing the punishment of reduction in ranks on the petitioner from the post of Assistant Secretary to the post of Clerk vide order dated 31.03.2012. Against which, the petitioner preferred revision and the revisional authority, vide proceedings dated 24.09.2012, simply confirmed the order of the disciplinary authority and dismissed the revision petition, without considering various grounds raised by the petitioner. Challenging the final order of the disciplinary authority and the order of the revisional authority, W.P.No.6267/2013 was filed.

viii) Learned counsel would further submit that the charges framed against him are flimsy and nothing but vindictive as there is no cordial



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

relationship between the petitioner and the then Secretary and Special Officer of the 2nd respondent Management. Admittedly, none of the members who alleged to have complained to the 2nd respondent society about the functioning of the petitioner, were examined during the enquiry, whereas the letters and complaints obtained from members were marked in the domestic enquiry. Both Management as well as the Revisional Authority failed to note the specific ground raised by the petitioner that the petitioner has refused to become a member of the new Union formed by the Secretary of the 2nd respondent Society, which has prompted the then Secretary to foist false charges against the petitioner. Apart from that, the wife of the petitioner has given a police complaint against the then Secretary and Senior Clerk for the continuous harassment, threat and humiliation suffered by the petitioner and the complaint was enquired on 20.01.2011 by Kodumudi Police Station. Aggrieved by the same, the then Secretary lodged two complaints against the petitioner to the higher officials on 21.01.2011 and 28.01.2011. As per Special Bye law No.28(1)(vi) in Chapter.VI, the petitioner can be demoted only by one rank and not two ranks. The said Bye



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

law says that "Reduction to a lower rank in the seniority list or to a lower post to lower stage in a time scale". Therefore, the impugned orders are passed in clear violation of the aforesaid bye laws.

ix) Learned counsel would further submit that as far as W.P.No.8648/2015 is concerned, the salary of the petitioner was reduced from Rs.14,558/- to Rs.5,250/-, thereby treating the petitioner as a new entrant into the service. On the representation of the petitioner, the 2nd respondent passed resolution Nos.5 and 6 dated 29.01.2015, whereby they decided to disburse the correct salary of Rs.14,558/-, due and payable for the post of Clerk. But the 3rd respondent/Deputy Registrar of Cooperative Societies, Erode, vide order dated 10.02.015, directed the 2nd respondent not to revise the salary of the petitioner on the reason that W.P.No.6267/2013 challenging the order of demotion is pending before this Court. Learned counsel would further submit that the Deputy Registrar has no jurisdiction and authority to reduce the salary of the petitioner and this order itself shows that the authorities are determined to punish the petitioner in one way or the other.



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

x) Learned counsel would further submit that pending W.P.No.8648/2015, the petitioner obtained stay order in M.P.No.2 of 2015 in W.P.No.8648/2015. For the non-compliance of the said stay order, the petitioner filed Contempt Petition No.916 of 2015 and during the hearing of the contempt petition, the 2nd respondent management admitted that by mistake, the salary of the petitioner was reduced and paid the arrears of salary to the petitioner. Therefore, the contempt petition was closed. Therefore, the order impugned in W.P.No.7648/2015 is liable to be set aside and moreover, the 2nd respondent society themselves have admitted that by mistake, the salary of the petitioner was reduced and paid the arrears of salary to the petitioner.

5. i) On the contrary, the learned counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent Management would submit that as far as the 1st charge is concerned, it is with regard to the willful disobedience to the orders issued by the Special officer and the Secretary of the 2nd respondent Society. The petitioner was looking after jewel loan and fixed deposits sections. Eventually in those two sections, the jewel loans had increased and the



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

arrears of rents for the locker had piled up and the need to expedite the system to inform the customers about the maturity date of their fixed deposits had also arose. Therefore, to meet out the aforesaid eventuality, by proceedings dated 5.2.2011, the petitioner was asked to look after cash section and in his place one L.Muthukumar was transferred to look after the jewel loan and fixed deposit sections. The petitioner willfully refused to obey the order and thereby, refused to take charge as cashier. In an another incident, by resolution dated 11.07.2011, the petitioner was directed to undergo the jewel appraisal training and he was issued with necessary order to that effect. But the petitioner once again, without any excuse has refused to go for the said training. In another occasion, the funding bank namely Erode District Central Co-operative Bank called for a review meeting on 21.09.2011 at 4.00 p.m. at office of EDCC Bank at Sivagiri. The 2nd respondent society received the notice of the matter at 11 a.m. on 21.09.2011. Immediately, the Secretary of the 2nd respondent society, instructed the petitioner, who was present at the office at that time, to attend the meeting, but the petitioner refused to attend the said meeting and simply



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

went out of the office under false pretext of meeting the Special Officer at Erode, which resulted in strained relationship with the supervisors of the EDCC Bank.

ii) Learned counsel would further submit that the petitioner's behavior is detrimental to the welfare of the 2nd respondent society and its members. The petitioner was specifically instructed to remain in office on 20.01.2011, since the rest of the staff had to attend an enquiry at Kodumudi Police Station, following a frivolous complaint. But the petitioner, without any leave of absence or intimation, willfully absented, which resulted in closing of the office on 20.01.2011, causing hardship to the customers. The petitioner was given specific instruction to pass the jewel loans, when the Secretary of the 2nd respondent society is on leave or out of station. This was intended to avoid delay or inconvenience to the customers as they need not wait for the arrival of Secretary. But the petitioner has wilfully failed to pass those loans by signing the relevant ledgers on many occasions and caused immense hardship to the customers.

iii) Learned counsel would further submit that as far as the third



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

charge is concerned, the petitioner failed to verify the entries of the Day Book from 27.04.2011 onwards which caused huge backlogs. Similarly, the petitioner failed to verify the balance figures in the Saving Account Pass Book of the Central Cooperative Bank vis-a-vis the Day Book of the 2nd respondent society, which resulted in huge difference between the said accounts.

iv) Learned counsel would further submit that the Enquiry officer conducted enquiry on various dates and after considering both oral and documentary evidence available on record, filed his report on 21.02.2012, finding the charges levelled against the petitioner, were proved. Thereafter, the petitioner was issued with a second show cause notice on 5.3.2012 enclosing the enquiry report, calling for his explanation for the proposed punishment. The petitioner sent explanation on 11.03.2012. Since the explanation was not satisfactory, the 2nd respondent passed the final order dated 31.03.2012, demoting the petitioner from the post of Assistant Secretary to the post of Clerk. Challenging the same, the petitioner filed revision under Section 153 of the TNCS Act before the 1st respondent and



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

the 1st respondent, dismissed the revision.

v) Learned counsel would further submit that in the resolution dated 29.01.2015, erroneously, the wages applicable prior to the order of 'reduction of rank' was ordered and thereafter, on knowing the error, the board of management, by resolution dated 23.04.2015 unanimously cancelled its earlier resolution dated 29.01.2015. The 2nd respondent has also in his letter dated 10.02.2015 has instructed the 2nd respondent not to restore the wages of Assistant Secretary to the petitioner until the disposal of W.P.No.6267/2013. Therefore, the learned counsel would pray to dismiss the writ petitions.

6. Learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the 1st & 3rd respondents would reiterate the contention of the learned counsel for the 2nd respondent and would submit that there is no illegality in conducting the domestic enquiry and the order of punishment imposed on the petitioner is correct.

7. This Court, considered the submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record.



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

8. When the petitioner was working as Assistant Secretary, three charges have been framed against him viz., i) deliberate disobedience, ii) behaved in a manner detrimental to the interest of the society and its members and iii) dereliction of duties and responsibilities assigned. The petitioner submitted his explanation on 08.11.2011. It is the contention of the petitioner that the then Special Officer and the Secretary colluded with each other and made the petitioner to do the work of Cashier which is lower rank than the post of Assistant Secretary, by passing a resolution No.4 dated 05.02.2011. The petitioner requested the 2nd respondent and explained that he cannot work in lower rank and allow him to discharge the duties of Assistant Secretary post. It is seen that the petitioner's request was not rejected by the 2nd respondent and the petitioner was also not insisted by the 2nd respondent that he should take over the charge of cashier post. Therefore, the question of disobedience does not arise.

9. As regards the allegation that as per resolution dated 17.02.2011, the petitioner did not attend the Jewel Appraiser Training Course is concerned, no written order has been issued to the petitioner and no



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

signature has been obtained from him. Therefore, without any written orders to the petitioner, the question of not undergoing the Jewel Appraiser Training Course, does not arise. Further, the jewel appraiser training is not required for discharging the duties of Assistant Secretary.

10. It is the contention of the petitioner that on 21.09.2011, when the then Secretary of the 2nd respondent Society asked the petitioner to go to Sivagiri and attend the meeting to be held by the Supervisor, the petitioner could not attend the same, as the Special Officer asked the petitioner to bring the loan application forms to Erode, since he was working at Circle Deputy Registrar's office there, for giving his approval and therefore, the petitioner was held up there and could not catch the earliest bus and could not return from Erode as there was also no frequent buses available and thus, he was unable to attend the meeting at Sivagiri, for the reason beyond his control. The said explanation of the petitioner is acceptable. It is also seen that only after making entry in the tour register, he left the office to Erode to see the Special Officer.

11. Further, the petitioner submitted his explanation stating that he



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

availed leave on 19.01.2011. On 20.01.2011, the petitioner and his wife were called for an enquiry on the basis of the complaint lodged by the petitioner's wife against the Secretary of the 2nd respondent society and the whole day, the petitioner was in the police station itself and he could not be able to attend the duty and this fact was well known to the 2nd respondent society and its officer. Without making alternative arrangements to open the office on 20.01.2011, shifting the entire burden on the petitioner, cannot be countenanced.

12. Without furnishing the copies of the relied on documents and without considering the explanation offered by the petitioner, domestic enquiry was conducted. The enquiry officer conducted enquiry on 30.12.2011, 19.01.2012, 04.02.2012 and 06.02.2012. During the last date of domestic enquiry, i.e., on 6.2.2012, due to ill health, the petitioner could not participate, after post lunch session and he also submitted leave letter to the enquiry officer but the enquiry officer simply adjourned the enquiry to post lunch session of the same day i.e., on 6.2.2012 and no further enquiry was conducted during post lunch session on 06.02.2012 or on the subsequent



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

dates and no notice was issued to the petitioner about the closure of the domestic enquiry. The enquiry was abruptly closed on 6.2.2012 and a report was submitted on 21.02.2012 holding all the three charges are proved as against the petitioner.

13. The 2nd respondent issued the show cause notice dated 05.03.2012 to the petitioner as to why the punishment of dismissal from service should not be imposed on the petitioner and in the notice itself, the 2nd respondent admitted that they have accepted the domestic enquiry officer's report in full. This predetermined stand of the 2nd respondent management itself is fatal to the disciplinary proceedings initiated against the petitioner. Against the final order imposing the punishment of reduction in rank, the petitioner preferred revision and the same was dismissed.

14. First of all, there is no cordial relationship between the petitioner and the then Secretary and Special Officer of the 2nd respondent Management. The specific ground raised by the petitioner is that he refused to become a member of the new Union formed by the Secretary of the 2nd respondent Society. Aggrieved over the same, false charges have been made



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

against the petitioner. Further, the wife of the petitioner has given a police complaint against the then Secretary and Senior Clerk for the continuous harassment, threat and humiliation suffered by the petitioner and the complaint was enquired on 20.01.2011 by Kodumudi Police Station. Aggrieved by the same, the then Secretary lodged two complaints against the petitioner to the higher officials on 21.01.2011 and 28.01.2011. None of the members who alleged to have complained to the 2nd respondent society about the petitioner, were examined during the enquiry. Only the letters and the complaints obtained from members were marked in the domestic enquiry.

15. As per Special Bye law No.28(1)(vi) in Chapter.VI, the petitioner can be demoted only by one rank and not two ranks. The said Bye law says that "Reduction to a lower rank in the seniority list or to a lower post to lower stage in a time scale". Therefore, the impugned orders are passed in violation of the aforesaid bye laws and the same is also passed in a mechanical manner, with non-application of mind.

16. Further, insofar as W.P.No.8648/2015 is concerned, the salary of



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

the petitioner was reduced from Rs.14,558/- to Rs.5,250/- and the petitioner made representation and thereafter, the 2nd respondent passed resolution Nos.5 and 6 dated 29.01.2015, deciding to disburse the correct salary of Rs.14,558/-, due and payable for the post of Clerk. However, the 3rd respondent directed the 2nd respondent vide order dated 10.02.015, not to revise the salary of the petitioner, as W.P.No.6267/2013, challenging the order of demotion is pending before this Court.

17. It is seen from the records that pending W.P.No.8648/2015, the petitioner obtained stay order in M.P.No.2 of 2015 in W.P.No.8648/2015. Since the respondents did not comply with the said stay order, the petitioner filed Contempt Petition No.916 of 2015. While the contempt petition is pending, the 2nd respondent management admitted their mistake that the salary of the petitioner was reduced and paid the arrears of salary to the petitioner. Therefore, the contempt petition was closed.

18. For the reasons discussed above, this Court is of the opinion that the impugned orders are liable to be quashed. Accordingly, the Writ Petitions are allowed. The impugned orders dated 31.03.2012, 24.09.2012



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

WEB COPY

and 10.02.2015, are quashed. The respondents are directed to post the petitioner as Assistant Secretary with all consequential service and monetary benefits with effect from 01.04.2012. The said exercise shall be done by the respondents within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

18.04.2023

Index :Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
vsi

To

1. The Joint Registrar of Coop. Societies,
Erode Region, Erode,
Erode District.
2. The Special Officer,
AA528 Vazhaithottam Primary Agricultural
Co.op. Credit Society, Vazhaithottam Post,
Sivagiri Via - 638 109,
Erode District.
3. The Deputy Registrar of Coop. Societies,
Erode Circle, Erode,
Erode District.



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.6267/2013 & 8648/2015

J.NISHA BANU, J.

vsi

Pre-delivery order made in
W.P.Nos.6267 of 2013
& W.P.No.8648 of 2015

18.04.2023