



WEB COPY

W.P.No.14601 of



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.12.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE VIVEK KUMAR SINGH

W.P.No.14601 of 2022
and W.M.P.No.13798 of 2022

R.Nagarajan

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Divisional Security Commissioner,
Railway Protection Force,
New General Office/Annex,
Chennai – 600 003

... Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records pertinent to impugned proceedings no. nil of the respondent dated 07.01.2022 and quash the same and further direct the respondent to sanction and pay the compassionate allowance payable from the date of dismissal from service.

For Petitioner	: Mr.P.Ganesan for Mr.A.Mohamed Ismail
For Respondents	: Mr.N.Ramesh Special Panel Counsel



WEB COPY

W.P.No.14601 of



ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed for quashment of the impugned order passed by the respondent dated 07.01.2022 and to direct the respondent to sanction and pay the compassionate allowance payable from the date of dismissal from service.

2.Heard the learned counsel on either side and also perused the materials available on record.

3.The case of the petitioner herein is similar to that of the dispute which arose in the Civil Appeals in C.A.Nos.1763-1764 of 2022 (*the State of Karnataka and another Vs. Umesh*). In the said Civil Appeals, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has passed the following order:

“17. In the exercise of judicial review, the Court does not act as an appellate forum over the findings of the disciplinary authority. The court does not re-appreciate the evidence on the basis of which the finding of misconduct has been arrived at in the course of a disciplinary enquiry. The Court in the exercise of judicial review must restrict its review to determine whether: (i) the rules of nature justice have been complied with; (ii) the finding of misconduct is based on some evidence; (iii) the



WEB COPY

W.P.No.14601 of



statutory rules governing the conduct of the disciplinary enquiry have been observed; and (iv) whether the findings of the disciplinary authority suffer from perversity; and (v) the penalty is disproportionate to the proven misconduct. However, none of the above tests for attracting the interference of the High Court were attracted in the present case. The Karnataka Administrative Tribunal having exercised the power of judicial review found no reason to interfere with the award of punishment of compulsory retirement. The Division Bench of the High Court exceeded its jurisdiction under Article 226 and trenched upon a domain which falls within the disciplinary jurisdiction of the employer. The enquiry was conducted in accordance with the principles of nature of justice. The findings of the inquiry officer and the disciplinary authority are sustainable with reference to the evidence which was adduced during the enquiry. The acquittal of the respondent in the course of the criminal trial did not imagine upon the authority of the disciplinary authority or the finding of misconduct in the disciplinary proceeding.”

4. The subject matter in issue is also similar to that of the Civil Appeals filed in C.A.Nos.1763-1764 of 2022, in which the aforesaid order has been passed.



WEB COPY

5. In the light of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the Civil Appeals as stated supra, this Writ Petition is dismissed. However, the Competent Authority is directed to settle any pending dues to the petitioner forthwith. No costs. Consequently, connected Writ Miscellaneous Petition stands closed.

05.12.2024

mac

Index : Yes / No

Speaking order / Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

To

The Divisional Security Commissioner,
Railway Protection Force,
New General Office/Annex,
Chennai – 600 003



WEB COPY

W.P.No.14601 of



VIVEK KUMAR SINGH, J.

mac

W.P.No.14601 of 2021

05.12.2024