



W.P.(MD).No.23270 of 2024

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 05.12.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

W.P(MD)No.23270 of 2024

and

W.M.P(MD) Nos.19707 and 24838 of 2024

A.Muthumani

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Sivakasi Division,
Virudhunagar District.

2. The Treasury Officer,
District Treasury,
Tirunelveli.

3. The Assistant Treasury Officer,
Sub Treasury,
Tirunelveli Town,
Tirunelveli District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the first respondent i.e., the Revenue Divisional Officer, Sivakasi in his proceedings in Na.Ka.A3/5876/2023-21, dated 25.05.2024 and quash the same and consequently direct the third respondent i.e., the Assistant



W.P.(MD).No.23270 of 2024

Treasury Officer, Sub Treasury, Tirunelveli not to effect any recovery and to refund the recovery already effected from the month of July and August, 2024.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Visvalingam

For Respondents : Mr.D.Sasikumar
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

The instant Writ Petition has been filed by a retired Village Administrative Officer, challenging the order of recovery passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer, on the ground that excess House Rent Allowance was paid to the petitioner, while he was in service.

2. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that at the instance of the petitioner, the respective Tahsildar has disbursed the excess House Rent Allowance to the writ petitioner and the excess amount is sought to be recovered. In the impugned order, there is no reference about the period during which the alleged excess House Rent Allowance has been disbursed to the writ petitioner. The impugned order is also vague with regard to the applicability of the relevant Government Orders for payment of House Rent Allowance to the Village Administrative Officers.



W.P.(MD).No.23270 of 2024

WEB COPY

3. The petitioner herein had retired 10 years prior to the passing of the impugned order. There is no allegation in the impugned order that the excess House Rent Allowance was paid to the writ petitioner due to the misrepresentation made by him. Since no Government Orders have been referred to in the impugned order relating to the disbursement of House Rent Allowance, this Court is not in a position to arrive at a finding whether at all any excess House Rent Allowance was paid to the writ petitioner.

4. In such circumstances, the petitioner, having retired 10 years back and the recovery is sought to be made after the retirement, this Court is of the considered opinion that the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in *(2015) 4 SCC 334* in the case of *(State of Punjab and other Vs. Rafiq (white washer) and others)*, is squarely applicable to the facts of the present case.

5. This Hon'ble Court, in a batch of 68 cases, by way of separate orders on 11.06.2024 has allowed similar writ petitions with a direction to refund the amount, if any already recovered.



W.P.(MD).No.23270 of 2024

WEB COPY

6. Considering the above said facts, the order impugned in the writ petition is set aside and in case, if any recovery has already been made, the respondents herein are directed to refund the same, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. With the above said observations, this Writ Petition stands allowed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

05.12.2024

NCC : Yes/No
Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
ebsi

To

1. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Sivakasi Division,
Virudhunagar District.

2. The Treasury Officer,
District Treasury,
Tirunelveli.

3. The Assistant Treasury Officer,
Sub Treasury,
Tirunelveli Town,
Tirunelveli District.

4/5



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD).No.23270 of 2024

R.VIJAYAKUMAR,J.

ebsi

W.P(MD)No.23270 of 2024

05.12.2024