



WEB COPY

W.P.No.19090 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 29.10.2025

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.S.RAMESH
AND
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SAKTHIVEL

W.P.No.19090 of 2023
and
W.M.P.No.18340 of 2023

1.Union of India,
Rep. by its General Manager,
Southern Railway, Chennai – 600 003.

2.The Senior Divisional Personnel Officer/TPJ,
Tiruchirappalli Division, Southern Railway,
Tiruchirappalli – 620 020.

...Petitioners

Vs.

1.Government of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by its Secretary/Chairman,
Scrutiny Committee – III,
Adi Dravidar & Tribal Welfare Department,
Namakkal Kavignar Maaligai,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Collector,
Villupuram Division,
Villupuram.

3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Villupuram District,
Villupuram.

4.L.Kuppulingam

...Respondents



W.P.No.19090 of 2023

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records relating to the impugned proceedings of the 1st respondent in proceedings No.24975/CV-6/2018-5 dated 31.03.2022 and quash the same and further direction to permit the petitioners to take necessary penal action against the 4th respondent in accordance with law.

For Petitioners : Mr.C.Samivel

For R1 to R3 : Mr.R.Kumaravel,
Additional Government Pleader

For R4 : Mr.V.Elangovan

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by M.S.RAMESH,J.)

The 4th respondent herein was appointed in the office of the 2nd petitioner on 14.03.1983 through a recruitment process conducted by the Railway Recruitment Board. The 2nd petitioner had requested the State Level Scrutiny Committee (SLSC)/1st respondent to cause verification of the genuineness of the community certificate issued by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Villupuram, dated 14.12.2015, in respect of the 4th respondent. After verification, the SLSC had arrived at a decision that the community certificate dated 14.12.2015 issued to the 4th respondent is genuine, through its proceedings dated 31.03.2022, which order is put under challenge in the present Writ Petition.



W.P.No.19090 of 2023

WEB COPY

2.The main ground raised by the petitioners is that while the 4th respondent father's community certificate shows that he belonged to Hindu-Vanniyar community, which is recognised as Most Backward Class, his brother's community certificate shows it as Kurumbar, which aspect was not properly considered by the SLSC.

3.On the request of the 2nd petitioner, the Deputy Superintendent of Police, SC/ST Vigilance, Villupuram (hereinafter referred to as 'DSP') had conducted an enquiry and submitted a report. The said enquiry was conducted as per the guidelines issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Kumari Madhuri Patil Vs. Additional Commissioner, Tribal Development and Others*** reported in (1994) 4 SCC 488. Along with the report, the DSP had also enclosed the school records, where the 4th respondent had studied between 1974 and 1977, which refers to his community as Kurumbar. The SSLC certificate also mentions the same community, namely Hindu-Kurumbar. The field enquiry report made by the Village Administrative Officer (VAO) of V.Maruthur Village also reported the 4th respondent's community as Hindu-Kurumbar. Likewise, the Revenue Divisional Officer, Villupuram, had also certified that the community certificate issued to the 4th respondent is genuine. This apart,



W.P.No.19090 of 2023

the Anthropologist had also conducted a field enquiry at V.Maruthur Village and on the basis of the 4th respondent's history, the origin of the Kurumans, their food habits, clan details, marriage, birth and other ceremonies, concluded that the 4th respondent belongs to Hindu-Kurumans. It is on this basis that the SLSC had come to the conclusion that the community certificate of the 4th respondent is genuine.

4. When the enquiry of the SLSC was conducted strictly in accordance with the guidelines issued in ***Kumari Madhuri Patil's case (supra)*** and the final decision that the community certificate was genuine was based on the educational certificates, apart from the field enquiry report by the Anthropologist, which is a requirement as per ***Kumari Madhuri Patil's case (supra)***, apart from the educational testimonials and the VAO's report, we fail to understand as to how the petitioners, only on the strength of the 4th respondent's brother's certificate, can claim to set aside the proceedings of the SLSC.

5. When the decision arrayed in the order, holding the 4th respondent's community certificate to be genuine, is based on the Anthropologist's field enquiry report, this Court, in exercise of its powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, will not venture to further



W.P.No.19090 of 2023

adjudicate the proceedings only by looking the 4th respondent's brother's community certificate and come to the conclusion that his community certificate is not genuine, which would be impermissible. Thus, we find no reason to interfere with the proceedings of the SLSC, impugned before us.

6.At this juncture, it is submitted by the learned counsel for the 4th respondent that the 4th respondent has reached the age of superannuation in the year 2020 itself and the benefits have not been disbursed to him.

7.In the result, the Writ Petition stands dismissed with a direction to the petitioners herein to forthwith pass necessary orders, disbursing the retirement and pensionary benefits to the 4th respondent herein, as expeditiously as possible, in any event, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

[M.S.R.,J] [R.S.V.,J]
29.10.2025

Index:Yes
Neutral Citation:Yes
Speaking order
hvk



WEB COPY



W.P.No.19090 of 2023

M.S.RAMESH, J.
and
R.SAKTHIVEL, J.

hvk

To

1.The Secretary/Chairman,
Scrutiny Committee – III,
Adi Dravidar & Tribal Welfare Department,
Namakkal Kavignar Maaligai,
Secretariat, Chennai – 600 009.

2.The District Collector,
Villupuram Division,
Villupuram.

3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Villupuram District,
Villupuram.

W.P.No.19090 of 2023

29.10.2025