



WEB COPY



W.P.No.11280 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.01.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE BATTU DEVANAND

W.P.No.11280 of 2018
and W.M.P.No.13178 of 2018

M.Satya

... Petitioner

Versus

1.The Tahsildar
Kottagiri,
Kottagiri Post,
The Nilgiris – 643 217.

2.The Collector of Nilgiris
Udhagamandalam
The Nilgiris District – 643 001.

... Respondents

Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records relating to the impugned proceedings dated 13.03.2018 in Na.Ka.A1 No.345/2018 passed by the 1st respondent herein and quash the same.

For Petitioner : M/s.A.Bobbli
For Respondents : Mr.E.Vijay Anand, AGP

ORDER


Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Government Pleader for the respondents and perused the materials available on record.



WEB COPY

2. The case of the petitioner is that she was appointed as Village Administrative Officer on 17.04.2012 and after completing Trainings in various villages in Nilgiris District. Whileso, the petitioner was serving at Nedukula-I Village holded additional in charge for Nedukula-II Village from 22.09.2012 to 25.02.2013 as per the direction issued by the 1st respondent. Thereafter, the petitioner claimed payment for the work done as VAO, additional in charge for the aforesaid period, the claim was processed and approved by the 1st respondent and forwarded to the Treasury Officer and after due verification a sum of Rs.13,868/- was paid during January 2014.

3. Subsequently, the petitioner received a notice in Na.Ka.A1.No.345/2018 dated 13.03.2018 issued by the 1st respondent stating that the employees belonging to Group-C service are not eligible to get the payment for the work done as additional in charge and only the Group “A” and “B” service employees are eligible for the payment and directed to repay the amount received immediately. Thereafter, the petitioner made a representation dated 18.04.2018 to the 1st respondent, praying to drop the proceedings for recovery. As there is no response from the respondents, left with no other alternative remedy, the petitioner filed the present writ petition.



6. The learned counsel further contends that the impugned order is erroneous, in view of the fact that the petitioner worked as VAO additional in charge as per the directions given by the 1st respondent.



7. On the other hand, the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents submits that the additional pay can be sanctioned for holding one or more posts to Group A & B officers only, Group C & D employees were not eligible for additional pay for holding full additional charge. The petitioner has wrongly claimed the said amount by misrepresentation. It is not excess payment made to the petitioner, as such, the learned counsel sought for dismissal of the writ petition.

8. It is an undisputed fact, while the petitioner was serving as VAO at Nedukula-I Village, she was given additional in charge of Nedukula-II village from 22.09.2012 to 25.02.2013, for holding additional in charge post, the petitioner was paid an amount of Rs.13,868/- as special allowance. By impugned proceedings dated 13.03.2018, the 1st respondent directed the petitioner to refund the amount paid to her towards special allowances for holding additional in charge.

9. This Court gave anxious consideration to the submissions made by the respective counsels and carefully perused the materials available on record including the reliance placed by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

10. Admittedly, in the present case, before passing the impugned order, the 1st respondent did not choose to issue show cause notice to the petitioner calling for her



explanation. It is settled law that without issuing any notice to the aggrieved party, passing an order is in violation of the principles of natural justice. As such, in our considered view, the order impugned in this writ petition is passed in violation of the principles of natural justice.

11. In fact, on several occasions, identical issue came up for consideration before this Court. By following the proposition of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Rafiq Masih (White Washer) (supra)***, this Court set aside the proceedings of recovery in ***W.P.No.6945 of 2022, dated 26.06.2023*** and in ***W.P.(MD) No.16106 of 2016, dated 20.07.2023***. The relevant portion of the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in ***Rafiq Masih (White Washer) (supra)***, is extracted hereinunder:

“18. It is not possible to postulate all situations of hardship, which would govern employees on the issue of recovery, where payments have mistakenly been made by the employer, in excess of their entitlement. Be that as it may, based on the decisions referred to herein above, we may, as a ready reference, summarise the following few situations, wherein recoveries by the employers, would be impermissible in law:

(i) Recovery from employees belonging to Class-III and Class-IV service (or Group C and Group D service).

(ii) Recovery from retired employees, or employees who



are due to retire within one year, of the order of recovery.

(iii) Recovery from employees, when the excess payment has been made for a period in excess of five years, before the order of recovery is issued.

(iv) Recovery in cases where an employee has wrongfully been required to discharge duties of a higher post, and has been paid accordingly, even though he should have rightfully been required to work against an inferior post.

(v) In any other case, where the Court arrives at the conclusion, that recovery if made from the employee, would be iniquitous or harsh or arbitrary to such an extent, as would far outweigh the equitable balance of the employers right to recover.”

12. In the judgment cited supra, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that recovery from employees belonging to Class III and Class IV service or Group C and Group D service and recovery from retired employees or employees who are due to retire within one year of the order of recovery would be impermissible in law.

13. In the present case, the petitioner belongs to Group C employee, as such, the action of the 1st respondent in issuing the impugned order for recovery from the petitioner is impermissible under law, as such the impugned order is liable to be set aside.



W.P.No.11280 of 2016

14. On consideration of the facts and circumstances of the present case and in the light of the authorities cited supra, this Court has no hesitation to hold that the action of the first respondent in issuing the impugned order of recovery is illegal, arbitrary and unjust and in violation of the principles of natural justice and accordingly, the impugned order is hereby set aside.

15. For the above reasons, this Writ petition is allowed.

16. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

17. There shall be no order as to costs.

29.01.2024

Index :Yes/No

Neutral Citation :Yes/No

tsh

To

1.The Tahsildar
Kottagiri, Kottagiri Post,
The Nilgiris – 643 217.

2.The Collector of Nilgiris
Udhagamandalam
The Nilgiris District – 643 001.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.11280 of 2018

BATTU DEVANAND, J.

tsh

W.P.No.11280 of 2018

29.01.2024.