



WEB COPY



CMP NO. 1919 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14-02-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE R. SUBRAMANIAN

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

CMP Nos. 1919 of 2025 and 1914 of 2025

in

WA NO. 2959 OF 2024

S. Aravindan

S/o. Singaram, No. 1/107, Main Road, Mettupalayam
and Post, Thiruthuraipoondi Taluk, Thiruvarur
District.

Appellant(s)

Vs

The Chief Engineer (AE)

Agricultural Engineering Department, Nandanam,
Chennai-35. and 2 Others

Respondent(s)

CMP NO. 1914 of 2025

S. Aravindan

S/o. Singaram, No. 1/107, Main Road, Mettupalayam
and Post, Thiruthuraipoondi Taluk, Thiruvarur
District.

Appellant(s)

Vs

The Chief Engineer (AE)

Agricultural Engineering Department, Nandanam,
Chennai-35. and 2 Others

Respondent(s)



For Petitioner(s):

P.Vijendran
V.Chithra
Manikuyil.K

For Respondent(s):

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by the Hon'ble R.Subramanian J.)

We find that both these Civil Miscellaneous Petitions are mis-conceived. Earlier the appellant had filed a Writ Petition challenging the order dated 25.03.2024 suspending him mainly on the ground that the order of suspension was passed on the eve of retirement. The said Writ Petition was dismissed by the writ Court by order dated 27.03.2024. Aggrieved, the petitioner preferred an appeal in W.A.No.2959 of 2024. The appellate Bench had directed completion of the disciplinary enquiry within a period of three (3) months from the date of receipt of a copy of the order. This order in the Writ Appeal was passed on 02.12.2024. Admittedly the three months period is not yet over. It is for the Authority to complete the enquiry within the said period, failing which the petitioner will be entitled to seek review of the suspension order as per the order of the Division Bench dated 02.12.2024.

2. In view of the above position, we find that the petition for extension of time filed by the petitioner is unnecessary since the time granted is not yet



expired.

WEB COPY

3. It is also the complaint of the petitioner that the respondents have not furnished necessary documents to him. We do not think such a complaint can be raised in the miscellaneous petition in a disposed of appeal, challenge in which was to the order of suspension. If there is a failure to produce the documents, it will be open to the appellant to take advantage of such failure.

4. Hence, both these applications are **dismissed**.

(R.SUBRAMANIAN J.) (G.ARUL MURUGAN J.)
14-02-2025

dsa

To

1. The Chief Engineer (AE)
Agricultural Engineering Department, Nandanam, Chennai-35.

2. The Assistant Executive Engineer (AE)
Agricultural Implements Workshop,
Thiruvarur District.

3. The Chief Secretary to Government
Government of Tamilnadu,



Secretariate, Fort St.George, Chennai-9.



WEB COPY