IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.02.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD

W.P.No.12520 of 2012

T.S.Subramanian ...Petitioner

-Vs-

1.The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009.

2.The Principal Secretary and Commissioner of
Revenue Administration,
Chepauk,
Chennai – 600 005.

3.The District Collector,
Rajaji Salai,
Chennai 600 001. ...Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a direction in the nature of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records of the 1st respondent made in G.O.(2D)No.55 Revenue (Ser4(2)) Department dated 15.02.2012 by confirming the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent made in R.C.No.Ser.3(1)/19682/10 dated 17.09.2010 and the impugned order passed by the 3rd respondent made in R.C.No.A4/32192/2005 dated 12.02.2010 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents for restoration of the original seniority in the cadre of Tahsildar for the year 2009 in the appropriate place.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.N.Umapathi

For Respondents : Mr.M.Rajendiran
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This writ petition is filed for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to quash the order of the 1st respondent made in G.O.(2D)No.55 Revenue (Ser4(2)) Department dated 15.02.2012 by confirming the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent made in R.C.No.Ser.3(1)/19682/10 dated 17.09.2010 and the impugned order passed by the 3rd respondent made in R.C.No.A4/32192/2005 dated 12.02.2010 and consequently direct the respondents for restoration of the original seniority in the cadre of Tahsildar for the year 2009 in the appropriate place.

2. The case of the petitioner is that while he was an Assistant in Mambalam Guindy Taluk in the year 2001, one Thiru.R.Vijayashankar applied for a legal heirship certificate vide his application dated 29.01.2001 in the file No.2091/01 consequent on the death of his father, R.Radha

Ramanan, who died on 14.08.1994. The Revenue Inspector after inquiry, submitted a report dated 07.03.2001 on a printed (cyclostyled) paper duly furnishing the legal heirs of Thiru.R.Radha Ramanan, and recommended for issue of legal heirship certificate. The Revenue Inspector omitted to mention the name of the deceased and left the space as blank in the printed (cyclostyled) paper. However, he mentioned the correct date of death of the deceased as 14.08.1994. Further, there was ample evidence, such as Death Certificate to note the name of the deceased, appointment order, service certificate of the employer etc. There is no lapse on the part of the petitioner in perusing and scrutinizing the legal heirs of the deceased. The applicant stated in his two petitions dated 29.01.2001 in File No.2091/01 and 20.02.2001 in File No.5808/01 that his father, R.Radha Ramanan died on 14.08.1994. Hence, the petitioner herein after perusal and scrutiny of the reports of the Revenue Inspector along with other connected documents, submitted the same to the Tahsildar through Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar for orders as to whether the legal heirship certificate can be issued based on the Revenue Inspector's report. The then Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar and the Tahsildar in turn, after perusing all the connected documents and report of the Revenue Inspector issued the wrong legal heirship certificate on

13.03.2001 in file No.D1/2091/01. The same was prepared by someone, other than the petitioner herein, mentioning the name of the deceased as R.Vijayashankar (applicant's name) instead of correct name of the deceased, R.Radha Ramanan.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Zonal Officer and Additional Personal Assistant to the Collector investigated the matter and reported on 15.10.2004 that someone other than the petitioner had prepared the defective legal heirship certificate. After a lapse of 2 ½ years, the said applicant, Thiru.R.Vijayashankar made a representation in his letter dated 24.06.2003 to the Tahsildar, Mambalam Guindy Taluk, to issue a rectified legal heirship certificate, correcting the name of the deceased as R.Radha Ramanan. He made further representation on 27.06.2003. Thereafter, a legal notice dated 07.10.2003 was issued to the Tahsildar on behalf of the applicant for the issuance of the rectified legal heirship certificate.

4. Learned counsel further submitted that when the matter was pending before the Tahsildar for inquiry the said applicant

Thiru.R.Vijayashankar, moved a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court and this Court in W.P.No.36570 of 2003 by order dated 15.12.2003, directed the Tahsildar, Guindy Mambalam Taluk, to dispose of the representation made by the writ petitioner through his counsel dated 07.10.2003 and pass an order one-way or other within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the order. Subsequently, the Tahsildar issued a rectified legal heirship certificate in File No.D1/798/04 dated 18.08.2004 to the applicant based on the report of the same Revenue Inspector and the remarks of the petitioner herein already available in File No.D1/2091/01. The authorities made no further inquiry . This itself proved that the remarks of the petitioner herein made in the year 2001 in File No.D1/2091/01 were correct and the same was again accepted by the Tahsildar for the issue of the rectified certificate in the year 2004.

5. Learned counsel further submitted that the Joint Commissioner (Land Revenue), Revenue Administration, in his letter R.A.5(3)/64130/04 dated 10.05.2005, addressed the Collector to take disciplinary action against the persons responsible for the issue of defective legal heirship certificate. Then, a report was called for in the letter No.RA V(3)/64130/04 dated

31.08.2005, on the action taken against the other officials who were responsible for the issue of the wrong legal heirship certificate and also on the officials who delayed the issue in giving the corrected certificate, which caused the applicant to approach the Court for early remedy.

6. Learned counsel further submitted that though charges were framed against the petitioner herein, no charges were framed against the Assistant, who actually prepared the defective legal heirship certificate and the Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar, who scrutinized and forwarded the file to the Tahsildar and the Tahsildar, who again scrutinized the file, affixed his signature and issued the defective legal heirship certificate. This itself proves that the charges framed against the petitioner herein to make him as a scapegoat by leaving the persons who actually committed the mistake are nothing but absolutely motivated and with utter bias. The then Tahsildar Thiru.S.Dharmalingam and Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar Thiru.Francis Milton were allowed to retire on 30.09.2003. If the request of the applicant for issue of rectified legal heirship certificate was complied with in the year 2003, the applicant would have not approached the Hon'ble High Court. For such non-compliance, no action was initiated against the concerned officials.

But the charges were framed against the petitioner herein, who submitted the file to the Tahsildar for orders in the year 2001. This itself proves that the charges were framed with ulterior motive and with utter bias. After a lapse of nearly 8 years from the date of issue of the defective legal heirship certificate, the Disciplinary Authority (3rd respondent) i.e., the Collector issued a charge memo dated 05.01.2009 containing 3 charges under rule 17(b) of the Tamil Nadu Civil Services (Disciplinary & Appeal) Rules against the petitioner herein are as follows:

> "***Charge 1***: *hat Thiru.T.S.Subramanian, formerly Assistant, Mambalam – Guindy Taluk, Chennai 78 now upgraded Deputy Tahsildar, Puraswalkam Perambur Taluk, Chennai 11 while working as Assistant in Mambalam Guindy Taluk failed to scrutinize the Revenue Inspector's report, which led for the issue of wrong legal heirship certificate.*
>
> ***Charge 2***: *That he got orders for the issue of legal heirship certificate based on the incomplete report of the Revenue Inspector.*
>
> ***Charge 3*** *: Due to the above act, a legal heirship certificate was issued wrongly, which brough disrepute to the Administration."*

7. The petitioner herein in his written explanation dated 30.03.2009 refuted the charges levelled against him and requested the Collector to drop

all the charges framed against him. After the submission of written explanation, as the petitioner herein denied all the charges levelled against him, the Disciplinary Authority (3rd respondent) i.e., Collector, appointed Inquiry Officer on 16.04.2009 in Proc.A4/32192/05. The petitioner herein submitted further statement to the Inquiry Officer on 17.06.2009. The Inquiry Officer in his findings dated 11.08.2009 held that Charge No.1 is proved and Charges 2 and 3 have not been proved. In his findings, he observed that the petitioner herein might have approached the Revenue Inspector in person to fill up the name of the deceased (or) returned the reports of the Revenue Inspector. The name of the deceased is already available in the Death Certificate, based on which the name and date of the death of the deceased have to be filled up in the legal heirship certificate, deposition etc. Thus, the findings of the Inquiry Officer have led to red-tapism, but the Disciplinary Authority (3rd respondent) failed to note all these issues. The Disciplinary Authority (3rd respondent) also failed to notice that when the applicant approached the Taluk office in the year 2003 for issue of rectified legal heirship certificate, his representations were not attended to. Then the applicant moved the Hon'ble High Court for issue of rectified legal heirship certificate. No action was initiated against the officials concerned for their inaction in the year 2003, but the petitioner herein alone had been made as scapegoat. The respondents failed see that the issue of defective legal heirship certificate (not by the petitioner herein) led to no monetary loss or financial implication for the Government tampering of records or forging of documents. It is not a fit case for framing charges under Rule 17(b) of the Tamil Nadu Civil Services (Disciplinary & Appeal) Rules.

8. Learned counsel further submitted that the respondents failed to see that when charge no.2, 'that the petitioner herein had obtained orders for the issue of legal heirship certificate based on the incomplete report of the Revenue Inspector' was dropped, then charge No.1, 'failed to scrutinize the Revenue Inspector's report', should have also been dropped as they are interrelated. The Disciplinary Authority (3rd respondent), i.e., the Collector, failed to examine the report of the Inquiry Officer in detail. Instead of discharging the petitioner herein from charge no.1, inflicted the punishment of stoppage of increment for 6 months with cumulative effect, which will affect the pensionary benefits also in Pro.A4/32192/2005 dated 12.02.2010. Against the orders of the Collector inflicting the punishment of stoppage of increment for 6 months with cumulative effect, the petitioner herein filed an

appeal petition to the Appellate Authority (2nd respondent) Principal Secretary / Commissioner of Revenue Administration, Chepauk, Chennai 5 on 18.03.2010. The Appellate Authority (2nd respondent) in his order RC.No.Ser3(1)/19682/10 dated 17.09.2010 page no.4 para no.4 accepted the explanation of the petitioner herein. It clearly says that the report of the Revenue Inspector was scrutinized by the appeal petitioner (the petitioner herein) with supporting documents, ie., Death certificate, appointment order of the deceased, service certificate of the employer, ration card and submitted for orders from the Tahsildar. The charges would have been dropped, but the appeal was merely rejected on the grounds that the petitioner herein was subject dealing Assistant. This is not relevant to the charges framed against the petitioner herein. It proves that the Appellate Authority (2nd respondent) did not want to take a different stand with the orders of the Collector. Apart from that, the Appellate Authority (2nd respondent), failed to deal with the grounds raised by adducing reasons. Against the orders of the Principal Secretary/Commissioner of Revenue Administration, a revision petition was submitted to the Revision Authority (1st respondent) Secretary to Government, Revenue Department, Secretariat, Chennai 9, on 18.10.2010. The Government in their G.O.(2D) No.55, Revenue (Ser.4(2) Department, dated 15.02.2012 concluded that the revision petitioner did not adduce any fresh or valid reasons to support his claim for setting aside the orders of the Collector of Chennai awarding the punishment of stoppage of increment and rejected the petition as devoid of merits. He further submitted that though the punishment period expired on 30.06.2011, the Disciplinary Authority, i.e., the Collector, has not granted normal promotion without assigning any reason therefor. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has come forward with the present writ petition.

9. A counter was filed on behalf of the respondents dated 14.06.2013.

10. Learned Additional Government Pleader for the respondents submitted that the then Assistant / petitioner got orders on the report of the Revenue Inspector from the Tahsildar for issuing legal heir certificate. However, the legal heir certificate was prepared by someone other than the petitioner herein by mentioning the name of the deceased as R.Vijayashankar (applicant's name) instead of the correct name of the deceased and this happened due to the inaction of the petitioner. The Revenue Inspector,

Mambalam-Guindy Taluk in his inquiry report, had omitted to mention the name of the deceased. They failed to note the above omission and put up the file for getting orders of the Tahsildar. This paved the way for the issuance of an erroneous certificate and made the applicant Thiru.Vijayashankar to file writ petition before this Court. Hence, it was the inaction of the petitioner, as reported by the Zonal Officer and Additional Personal Assistant to the Collector, leads to the wrong issuance of the legal heir certificate.

11. Learned Additional Government Pleader further submitted that the Zonal Officer & Additional Personal Assistant to the Collector, who made the inquiry in this issue, reported that the Revenue Inspector had omitted to mention the name of the deceased in his report and the then subject dealing Assistant/the petitioner got orders on the report of the Revenue Inspector from the Tahsildar for issuing legal heir certificate. The issuance of wrong legal heir certificate happened due to the negligence and inaction on the part of Assistant and hence the charges were framed against the petitioner and the Revenue Inspector. Further, the Tahsildar and the Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar have already crossed the age of the superannuation on the date of issue of charge memo to the petitioner herein.

Further, the limited period of 4 years, beyond which no action could be taken against the retired Government servants has also been crossed. Hence, no action was taken against the then Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar and Tahsildar. The issue of defective legal heirship certificate caused disrepute to the Government administration and showed the lethargic attitude of the petitioner. Hence, it is a fit case for framing charges under rule 17(b) of Tamil Nadu Civil Services (Discipline and Appeal) Rules. Further, the appeal petitions filed against the punishment inflicted on the petitioner was set aside by the respondents 1 and 2 respectively.

12. Learned Additional Government Pleader further submitted that initially, the name of the petitioner was not included in the said panel by the Collector, Chennai, stating that the punishment of stoppage of increment for six months with cumulative effect, awarded in 3rd respondent's proceedings No.A4/32192/2005 dated 12.02.2010, was in currency during the year 2011. The petitioner has filed an appeal petition before the 2nd respondent against the non-inclusion of his name in the panel of Tahsildar for the year 2011. The punishment of stoppage of increment for six months with cumulative effect was ordered on 12.02.2010 for the irregularities committed on

13.03.2001 and the crucial date for the drawal of the Tahsildar list for the year 2011 is 01.07.2011. As per the instructions given in Government Lr.No.52511/S/99-1 P&AR (S) Department, dated 01.10.1999 (for irregularities which occurred five years prior to the crucial date such punishment need not be held against the individual), in the proceedings of the 2nd respondent No.Ser3(1)/72155/2011 dated 30.08.2012, the 3rd respondent has been requested to include the name of the petitioner in the list of Tahsildar for the year 2011 at the appropriate place.

13. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

14. The petitioner was issued with a charge memo for issuance of a wrong legal heirship certificate on 13.03.2001 mentioning the name of the deceased as R.Vijayashankar (applicant's name) instead of correct name of the deceased R.Radha Ramanan. Thereafter, the said applicant Thiru.R.Vijayashankar made a representation in his letter dated 24.06.2003 to the Tahsildar, Mambalam Guindy Taluk, to issue a rectified legal heirship certificate, correcting the name of the deceased as R.Radha Ramanan after the delay of 2 ½ years. The representation of the applicant namely,

R.Vijayashankar was not acted upon by the respondents and he filed W.P.No.36570 of 2003 and this Court by order dated 15.12.2003 directed the Tahsildar, Mambalam Guindy Taluk, to dispose of the representation of the applicant dated 07.10.2003 within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the order. Thereafter, the Tahsildar issued a rectified legal heirship certificate in File No.D1/798/04 dated 18.08.2004 after delay of more than one year and that too as per the direction of this Court. There were three charges framed against the petitioner, charge Nos.2 and 3 were not held proved and in regard to charge No.1 that the petitioner failed to scrutinize the Revenue Inspector report which led to issue of wrong legal heirship certificate of the deceased Thiru.R.Radha Ramanan to the applicant namely, Thiru.R.Vijayashankar is held proved in the inquiry proceedings conducted by the 3rd respondent.

15. Based on the inquiry report, the 3rd respondent awarded the punishment of stoppage of increment for six months with cumulative effect for it that proved against the petitioner vide proceedings R.C.No.A4/32192/2005 dated 12.02.2010 there were total 4 officers who were responsible for the issuance of the wrong legal heirship certificate and

they are as follows:

1.Thiru.Dharmalingam, Tahsildar

2.Thiru.Francis Milton, Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar

3.The concerned Assistant / the Petitioner

4.Thiru.G.Venkatachalam, Revenue Inspector – IV

16. The first two officers attained the age of superannuation even before the issuance of the charge memo dated 05.01.2009. The wrong legal heirship certificate was issued on 13.03.2001 and on instruction from the Joint Commissioner (Land Revenue), Revenue Administration, in his letter R.A.5(3)/64130/04 dated 10.05.2005 after a delay of 4 years, he requested to inform the details of the disciplinary action taken against the official responsible for the issuance of the wrong legal heirship certificate. The said Joint Commissioner (Land Revenue), Revenue Administration, in his letter No.RA V(3)/64130/04 dated 31.08.2005 has also requested to inform the details of the disciplinary action taken against the officials responsible for issuance of the wrong legal heirship certificate. Thereafter, only the inquiry was conducted by the Zonal Officer and Additional Personal Assistant to the Collector and the charges were framed under rule 17(b) of the Tamil Nadu

Civil Services (Disciplinary & Appeal) Rules, which were framed by the 3rd respondent in his charge memo dated 05.01.2009 against the petitioner herein. The inquiry Officer submitted his report on 11.08.2009, holding that charge No.1 is proved and charge Nos.2 and 3 were not proved. After considering the explanation of the petitioner, the 3rd respondent awarded punishment of stoppage of increment for six months for the charges proved against him in proceedings No. R.C.No.A4/32192/2005 dated 12.02.2010. Aggrieved by the above order of punishment, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the 2nd respondent and review petition before the 1st respondent and both were rejected. The petitioner was imposed punishment by the 3rd respondent and the petitioner filed an appeal before the 2nd respondent and the same was rejected on 17.09.2010. Thereafter, he preferred revision before the 1st respondent and the same was also rejected by the Government vide G.O.(2D)No.55 Revenue (Ser4(2)) Department dated 15.02.2012. The only charge against the petitioner is that he did not scrutinize the report of the Revenue Inspector dated 07.03.2001 where he omitted to mention the name of the deceased and left the space blank, which led to the issuance of the wrong legal heirship certificate.

17. **It is an admitted fact that the petitioner has omitted to scrutinize the report of the Revenue Inspector as a Dealing Assistant of the concerned file in regard to issuance of legal heirship certificate. The Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar or the Tahsildar ought to have verified the same before issuing the legal heirship certificate and failing to do so and putting the blame solely on the petitioner is unsustainable and cannot be countenanced by this Court.**

18. **It is pertinent to note that the issuance of the legal heirship certificate is of the year 2001 and the inquiry was conducted in the year 2009 and the charge memo was issued on 05.01.2009 after a delay of 4 years. The 3rd respondent did not choose to take any action against the petitioner and other officials and only after the Joint Commissioner (Land Revenue), Revenue Administration, Disaster Management and Mitigation Department in letter No.R.A.5(3)/64130/2004 dated 10.05.2005 and the letter of the Special Commissioner and Commissioner of Revenue Administration in letter No.R.A.5(3)/64130/2004 dated 31.08.2005, the Zonal Officer and Additional Personal Assistant to the Collector, Chennai, made an**

inquiry for the issuance of wrong legal heirship certificate and reported that it happened due to inaction of the concerned Assistant (petitioner) and during the said period, the petitioner was working as an Assistant. Subsequently, the charge memo was issued on 05.01.2009. If the action was taken within a reasonable time, all the charges would have been framed against all the four Officers stated supra but due to the delay inaction on the part of the 3rd respondent, the charge memo was issued on 05.01.2009. In the meantime, the Tahsildar and the Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar, who are superior and Supervising Officers, Decision Authority and the Competent Authority to issue the legal heirship certificate, retired. Hence, no action was initiated against those two Officers.

19. **However, it is stated in the counter affidavit that the limitation period of four years after the retirement of the Government has passed. Hence, no action could be taken against the retired Officers, viz., Tahsildar and Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar, which can be attributed only to the delay on the part of the 3rd respondent in initiating action for the issuance of the wrong legal heirship certificate. The**

punishment was awarded to the petitioner after 9 years from the date of issuance of the wrong legal heirship certificate on 13.03.2001.

20. **As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, when charge No.2 i.e., the petitioner herein had obtained the orders for the issuance of the wrong legal heirship certificate based on the incomplete report of the Revenue Officer was dropped, then charge No.1 is failed to scrutinize who had also been dropped as they were interrelated.**

21. **Hence, the punishment of stoppage of increment for six months with cumulative effect awarded to the petitioner by the 3rd respondent in proceedings No.R.C.No.A4/32192/2005 dated 12.02.2010 has to be quashed on the following grounds:**

a) **The wrong legal heirship certificate was issued on 13.03.2001.**
b) **The inquiry was conducted only after the letter of the Joint Commissioner (Land Revenue), Revenue Administration, Disaster Management and Mitigation Department in letter No.R.A.5(3)/64130/2004 dated 10.05.2005 and the letter of the**

Special Commissioner and Commissioner of Revenue Administration in letter No.R.A.5(3)/64130/2004 dated 31.08.2005.

c) **The inquiry was conducted subsequent to the above orders of the year 2005. Hence, there was a delay of 6 years in conducting the inquiry and a delay of nearly 8 years in framing the charges under rule 17(b) of the Tamil Nadu Civil Services (Disciplinary & Appeal) Rules on 05.01.2009 by the 3rd respondent.**

d) **There were four Officers responsible for issuance of the wrong legal heirship certificate, but no action was taken against the first two Officers who are Supervising Authority/Officers of the 3rd respondent of the petitioner. Due to the inaction and delay on the part of the 3rd respondent in initiating action against them, they were left scot-free and retired on attaining the age of superannuation and the charge memo was issued on 05.01.2009.**

e) **The charge Nos.2 and 3 are not proved as per the inquiry Officer's report dated 11.08.2009.**

f) **The charge No.1 alone proved that when the charge No.2 is dropped, then automatically charge No.1 is also unsustainable.**

g) **The petitioner is only an Assistant and admittedly he has failed to**

note the omission of the name of the deceased person in the report submitted by the Revenue Inspector dated 07.03.2001.

h) The Tahsildar and Headquarters Deputy Tahsildar ought to have verified the particulars furnish in the Revenue Inspector's report delinquently before issuing the legal heirship certificate but they have failed to do so.

i) The wrong legal heirship certificate was issued on 13.03.2001 and a representation was given by the applicant on 24.06.2003 and 27.06.2003 and legal notice dated 07.10.2003. Despite this, the Tahsildar Mambalam Guindy Taluk did not issue the rectified/defective legal heirship certificate and it is only after the order dated 15.12.2003 passed by this Court in W.P.No.36570 of 2003 filed by the applicant, namely, R.Vijayashankar, Tahsildar issued the legal heirship certificate on 18.08.2004 i.e., after the delay of more than one year, as rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that no action was initiated against the Tahsildar for the delay in issuing the rectified/defective legal heirship certificate. It can be seen that the charge No.2 that the petitioner got an order for the issuance of the legal heirship

certificate based on the incomplete report of the Revenue Inspector was not proved by the inquiry Officer. Hence, the contention of the respondent in their counter affidavit repeatedly that the petitioner herein got orders on the report of the Revenue Inspector from the Tahsildar for the issuance of legal heirship certificate by directly putting up the file is unsustainable.

j) **The issuance of the defective legal heirship certificate has not led to any monetary loss to the Government. It happened on the records or forging of the documents, which would affect the administration of the 3rd respondent.**

k) **The order of the 3rd respondent imposing the punishment on the petitioner was passed in the year 2010 after a delay of nearly 9 years, i.e., from the date of the issuance of the wrong legal heirship certificate on 13.03.2001.**

22. **In view of the above factual matrix of the case, the order passed by the order of the 1st respondent made in G.O.(2D)No.55 Revenue (Ser4(2)) Department dated 15.02.2012 confirming the impugned order passed by the 2nd respondent made in**

R.C.No.Ser.3(1)/19682/10 dated 17.09.2010 and the impugned order passed by the 3rd respondent made in R.C.No.A4/32192/2005 dated 12.02.2010 are liable to be quashed and the same are hereby quashed. The respondents are directed to restore the original seniority of the petitioner in the cadre of Tahsildar in the year 2009 in the appropriate place within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of the order.

In the result, the **writ petition stands allowed with the above observations and directions.** No costs.

05.02.2024

cda
Index : Yes/No
Speaking/Non Speaking order

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
Revenue Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai 600 009.

2.The Principal Secretary and Commissioner of
Revenue Administration,
Chepauk,
Chennai – 600 005.

3.The District Collector,
Rajaji Salai,
Chennai 600 001.

J.SATHYA NARAYANA PRASAD, J.

cda

W.P.No.12520 of 2012

05.02.2024