



WEB COPY

WP No. 6914 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 21-03-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE C.V. KARTHIKEYAN

WP No. 6914 of 2025

and

W.M.P.No.7616 of 2025

P.Latha

Petitioner

Vs

1. The Principal Chief Conservator of
Forests (Head of Forest Force),
Velachery Main Road, Near
Kannigapuram Check Post,
Guindy, Chennai 600032.

2.The Chief Conservator of Forests
Tiruchirappalli Circle,
Tiruchirappalli District.

3.The District Forest Officer
Ariyalur Forest Division, Ariyalur.

Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents to provide / grant permission for the perusal of documents to face the disciplinary proceedings initiated by the 3rd respondent in Charge Sheet No.1 of 2022 dated 13.01.2022 issued under 17(b) of Tamil Nadu Civil Services (Disciplinary and Appeal) Rules.



WEB COPY

WP No. 6914 of 2025



For Petitioner(s): Mrs.G.Selvi George

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Rajesh
Government Advocate

ORDER

The writ petition has been filed in the nature of Mandamus seeking a direction against the first respondent to provide permission to peruse the documents, which are relied on by the respondents during the disciplinary proceeding initiated by the third respondent in Charge Sheet No.1 of 2022, dated 13.01.2022, issued under 17(b) of Tamil Nadu Civil Services (Disciplinary and Appeal) Rules.

2.In the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, it had been stated that the petitioner had been working as Superintendent in the office of the respondents. On 17.12.2021, she was placed under suspension and later a charge memo had been issue to her. The petitioner had given a representation seeking perusal of the documents relied on by the respondents to press home the charges. Complaining that she had been denied with that particular opportunity to peruse the documents, the writ petition had been filed.



3. During the hearing of the writ petition, this Court had directed the petitioner to go over to the office of the respondents and peruse the documents.

WEB COPY

It is informed that the petitioner had taken up that opportunity and had gone over to the office of the respondents and had perused the documents. The learned counsel for the petitioner however raised grievances that further documents have not been shown to her.

4. On the side of the respondents, it had been contended that the relevant documents had been given to the petitioner for perusal. The Court can never enter into any discussion about the relevancy of document either relied by the counsel for the petitioner or by the counsel for the respondents. They are matters for appreciation when they are produced as evidence before the enquiry officer. A document to be converted as evidence, has to be admissible, has to be relevant and has to be proved in the manner known to law. These are issues to be examined during the course of Trial. Even if there is an enquiry, it cannot be equivalent strictly to a trial. Still, a reasonable opportunity has to be given to both sides, the respondent to establish the charges and the petitioner to raise a



demur against the charges. No further orders are required. It would only be

appropriate that the petitioner participates in the enquiry and raises the issue

during the course of the enquiry.

5.The writ petition stands disposed of. No Costs. Consequently,
connected miscellaneous petition is also closed.

21-03-2025

sli

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet:Yes

Neutral Citation:Yes/No



To

1. The Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Head of Forest Force),
Velachery Main Road, Near Kannigapuram Check Post,
Guindy, Chennai 600032.

2. The Chief Conservator of Forests
Tiruchirappalli Circle,
Tiruchirappalli District.

3. The District Forest Officer
Ariyalur Forest Division, Ariyalur.



WEB COPY

WP No. 6914 of 2025



C.V.KARTHIKEYAN J.
sli

WP No. 6914 of 2025

21-03-2025