



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.03.2024

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

W.P.No.27521 of 2023

and

W.M.P.Nos.26960, 26961 & 26962 of 2023

K.Jayalakshmi

...Petitioner

-Vs-

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Municipal Administration and Water Supply (Ma.Na.4) Department,
Secretariat, Fort St., George, Chennai-600 009.

2. The Director of Municipal Administration,
No.75, Urban Administrative Buildings,
(Opposite to CIBA Building),
Santhome High Road,
M.R.C.Nagar, Raja Annamalai Puram.
Chennai-600 028.

3. The Commissioner,
Coimbatore City Municipal Corporation,
Big Bazar Street,
Coimbatore-641 001.

...Respondents



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for records relating to the proceedings of the Director of Municipal Administration, Chennai-28, the Second respondent made in ROC.No.16858/2016/V1 dated 25.06.2021, quash the same and forbear the respondents from any manner proceed with the above charge against the petitioner in future and direct the respondents to disburse all the service benefits which has been withheld by the respondents namely promotion to the post of Executive Engineer on par with her junior and all other consequential attendant, Monetary benefits with continuity of service, due seniority in the post of Executive Engineer on part with her immediate junior and disburse all the arrears.

For Petitioner	: Mr.S.Vijayakumar Senior counsel for Mr.K.Rajkumar
For Respondents 1 & 2	: Mr.K.Tamilvendan Government Advocate
For Respondent 3	: Mr.Najeeb Usman Khan Standing Counsel

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed challenging the proceedings of the Director of Municipal Administration, Chennai-28, the Second respondent made in ROC.No.16858/2016/V1 dated 25.06.2021, quash the same and forbear the respondents from any manner proceed with the above charge against the petitioner in future and direct the respondents to disburse all the



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

service benefits which has been withheld by the respondents namely promotion to the post of Executive Engineer on par with her junior and all other consequential attendant, Monetary benefits with continuity of service, due seniority in the post of Executive Engineer on par with her immediate junior and disburse all the arrears.

2. By invoking Rule 8(2) of the Coimbatore City Corporation Services (Discipline and Appeal) Rules, 1986, charges has to be framed against the petitioner through charge memo dated 25.06.2021. The nature of delinquency imputed against the petitioner is that, while she was working as Assistant Town Planning Officer (incharge), Central Zone, Coimbatore City Municipal Corporation, Coimbatore she has failed to take follow up action against lock and seat notices issued to three buildings and also she has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty expected from a Government Servant and acted in a manner unbecoming of a Government Servant and thus violated Rule 20 of the Tamilnadu Government Servants (Conduct) Rules 1973. Though the charges were leveled way back on 25.06.2021, there was no further progress in the departmental action.



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

WEB COPY

3. Pending the charges, eight posts of Executive Engineers have been sanctioned by the Government to Coimbatore City Municipal Corporation, Coimbatore. The charge is treated as 17(a) and the same would be put against the petitioner for getting promotion as Executive Engineer as per promotion rules. However, though the names of the petitioner's Juniors have been proposed for promotion, the petitioner's name was deferred, in view of the pendency of the impugned charge memo dated 25.06.2021. In this background, the petitioner had challenged the charge memo.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is an inordinate delay in framing the charges, as well as for completion of the inquiry proceedings and therefore, the charge memo itself is liable to be quashed.

5. Per contra, the learned standing counsel appearing for the 3rd respondent submitted that the petitioner has violated Rule 20 of the Tamilnadu Government Servants Conduct Rules and in case she is of the



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

view that she is not liable for the charges, it is always open to her to participate in the inquiry proceedings and as such, quashing of the charge memo is not warranted.

6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, as well as this Court, on several occasions, have held that the disciplinary proceedings requires to be initiated and concluded with a reasonable time, if the fault of the pendency was not due to delinquent's mistake. The learned single judge of this Court, in the case of *Kootha Pillai vs The Commissioner, Municipal Administration and 4 others passed in W.P.No.15231 of 2006 dated 05.11.2008*, had an occasion to refer to various decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and ultimately held that the inordinate delay in initiating and completing the disciplinary proceedings, would cause prejudice to the delinquent and therefore, the proceedings itself cannot be continued. Some of the decisions referred to by the learned Single Judge in Kootha Pillai's case (Supra) are as follows:-

"45. In State of Madhya Pradesh v. Bani Singh and another reported in 1990 (Supp) SCC 738, the Supreme Court had come down heavily against the laches on the part of the employer in



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

conducting departmental enquiry and after finding out that there was no satisfactory explanation for the inordinate delay, held that it would be unfair to order departmental enquiry to proceed further.

46. In *State of A.P., v. N.Radhakrishnan* reported in 1998 (4) SCC 154, the Supreme Court, at Paragraph 19, held as follows:

"Normally, disciplinary proceedings should be allowed to take its course as per relevant rules but then delay defeats justice. Delay causes prejudice to the charged officer unless it can be shown that he is to blame for the delay or when there is proper explanation for the delay in conducting disciplinary proceedings. Ultimately, the Court is to balance these two diverse considerations."

47. In *Union of India v. CAT* reported in 2005 (2) CTC 169 (DB), this Court held that,

"The delay remains totally unexplained. Therefore, we have no hesitation at all in concluding that the ground of inordinate delay in proceeding with the departmental enquiry as referred to above by us, would come in the way of the Govt. to continue with the enquiry any further....."

48. In *P.V.Mahadevan v. M.D. Tamil Nadu Housing Board* reported in 2005 (4) CTC 403, this Court after referring to various decisions, held that,

"The protracted disciplinary enquiry against a government employee should, therefore be avoided not only in the interest of the government employee but in public interests and also in the interests of inspiring confidence in the minds of the government employees. At this stage, it is necessary to draw the curtain and to put an end to the enquiry. The appellant had already suffered enough and more on account of the disciplinary proceedings. As a matter of fact, the mental agony and sufferings of the appellant due to the protracted



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

disciplinary proceedings would be much more than the punishment. For the mistakes committed by department in the procedure for initiating the disciplinary proceedings, the appellant should not be made to suffer.

15. We therefore, have no hesitation to quash the charge issued against the appellant. The appeal is allowed. The appellant will be entitled to all the retiral benefits in accordance with law. The retiral benefits shall be disbursed within three months from this date. No cost."

49. In The Special Commissioner and Commissioner of Commercial Taxes, Chepauk v. N.Sivasamy reported in 2005 (5) CTC 451, the Division Bench of this Court held as follows:

"Though the alleged lapse occurred in the Year 1995 and certain charges related to the period 1993-94, the charge memo was issued on 15.07.1997 and served on 23.07.1997, just 7 days before the date of retirement. The contention of the appellant that only we a view to cause hardship, agony and anguish, the charge memo was issued cannot be ignored... We have already pointed out that though the applicant failed Original Application No.6284/97, challenging the charge memo, dated 15.07.1997, admittedly, no stay was granted. Despite the above fact that the department had not proceeded with the disciplinary proceedings, there is an inordinate and unexplained delay on the part of the department. According to the applicant, he is 67 years of age as on the date and had rendered 38 years of service in the department. He had undergone sufferings from mental worry, agony, anguish and hardship for all these years. We are satisfied that there is no need to pursue the charge memo, dated 15.07.1997."

50. In yet another decision in R.Tirupathy and others v. the District Collector, Madurai District and others reported in 2006 (2) CTC 574, this Court was pleased to quash the charge memo, dated 02.02.2005 on the ground that the charges relate to purchase of



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

uniforms during the year 1994-95 and 1995-96 and the inordinate delay on the part of the department in issuing a charge memo was not properly explained.

*51. The Supreme Court in **M.V.Bijlani v. Union of India and other reported in 2006 (5) SCC 88**, quashed the order of removal from service, confirmed by the appellate authority on various grounds particularly, on the ground that initiation of disciplinary proceedings after six years and continuance thereof, for a period of seven years prejudiced the delinquent officer.*

*52. In **M.Elangovan v. The Trichy District Central Co-operative Bank Ltd., reported in 2006 (2) CTC 635**, this Court, while quashing the second show cause notice on the ground of inordinate and unexplained delay in initiating and completing the disciplinary proceedings, allowed the Writ Petitions holding that the petitioners therein were entitled to all the benefits in accordance with law. The same view has been expressed by this Court in yet another decision in **Parameswaran v. State of Tamil Nadu reported in 2006 (1) CTC 476**."*

7. The aforesaid extracts are self explanatory. Thus, it is seen that for the delinquency that occurred during the period between 14.02.2014 to 02.06.2014, the charges have been levelled only on 25.06.2021, which is after a period of 7 years. That apart, though the charges were framed on 25.06.2021, there was absolutely no further progress in the inquiry proceedings, except for appointment of an Inquiry Officer, that too, in the year 2023. Thus, the inordinate delay in failing to conclude the disciplinary proceedings would also be fatal to the Corporation.



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

WEB COPY

8. In view of the inordinate delay in concluding the department proceedings, the petitioner herein has been deprived of her promotion to the post of Executive Engineer. Now this Court has held that the charge memo itself cannot be legally sustained and the petitioner would be entitled for notional promotion to the post of Executive Engineer, if she is otherwise eligible.

9. Incidentally, through an interim order passed by this Court on 20.09.2023, the respondents were directed to keep one promotional post of Executive Engineer vacant, in which the petitioner herein can be accommodated.

10. In the light of the above observations and findings, the impugned order dated 25.06.2021, issued by the 2nd respondent herein, is quashed. Consequently, there shall be a direction to the respondents herein to forthwith pass orders, extending all the service benefits that may have been deprived to the petitioner, in view of the pendency of the charge memo



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

dated 25.06.2021. While passing such orders, the respondents shall also grant notional promotion to the petitioner for the post of Executive Engineer from the date on which her immediate junior was promoted and place her seniority in the post of Executive Engineer above her immediate junior. Such orders shall be passed atleast within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

11. In the result, the Writ petition stands allowed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs.

13.03.2024

Index : Yes/No
Speaking/Non-Speaking Order
Neutral Citation : Yes/No

gvn



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

WEB COPY

To

1. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Municipal Administration and Water Supply (Ma.Na.4) Department,
Secretariat, Fort St., George, Chennai-600 009.
2. The Director of Municipal Administration,
No.75, Urban Administrative Buildings,
(Opposite to CIBA Building),
Santhome High Road,
M.R.C.Nagar, Raja Annamalai Puram.
Chennai-600 028.
3. The Commissioner,
Coimbatore City Municipal Corporation,
Big Bazar Street,
Coimbatore-641 001.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.27521 of 2023

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN,J.
gvn

W.P.No.27521 of 2023

13.03.2024