



WEB COPY



W.P No.13559 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.07.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C. KUMARAPPAN

Writ Petition No.13559 of 2025

and

Writ Miscellaneous Petition Nos.15211 & 15212 of 2025

S.K.Shrirudhran

... Petitioner

..Vs..

1.The District Collector,
Thiruvallur.

2.The Sub-Collector,
Ponneri,
Thiruvallur District.

3.Mr.Kandhan

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the 1st respondent passed in his proceedings in Na.Ka.No.9596/2025/A1 dated 17.03.2025 and direct the respondents 1 to 3 not to interfere with his functioning as Village Administrative Officer at Kettanamalli Village, Gumidipoondi Taluk, Thiruvallur District until further counselling and consequently, quash the same and direct the 1st respondent assign the petitioner to one of the Village offices in the Ponneri Division of Thiruvallur District, which is the closest to the petitioner's residence.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Gokulakrishnan



WEB COPY

W.P No.13559 of 2025



For Respondents : Mr.R.U.Dinesh Rajkumar,
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

The instant writ petition has been filed with a prayer for Certiorarified Mandamus to quash the proceedings in Na.Ka.No.9596/2025/A1 dated 17.03.2025, passed by the 1st respondent.

2. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner would submit that the 3rd respondent with *mala fide* intention has transferred the petitioner from Kettanamalli Village, Gumidipoondi Taluk to Tiruttani Taluk. It is the further submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that within a period of four (4) months, the petitioner was transferred from Gumidipoondi Taluk and would contend that the transfer is purely made on *mala fide* intention. Hence, he prays to interfere with the impugned proceedings.

3. Per contra, the learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents would submit that the transfer is an administrative transfer and that, because of the petitioners' rude activities in the present working place, the District Administration earned bad name. Therefore, on an



administrative ground, the respondents transferred the petitioner to the present place. Hence, he prays to dismiss the same.

4. I have given my anxious consideration on either side submissions and also perused the materials available on record.

5. The primary contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the *mala fide* intention of the 3rd respondent is the reason for such transfer. However, on the basis of written instructions from the 2nd respondent, the learned Special Government Pleader would submit that the transfer was made on an administrative ground and such transfer was made only upon the bad behaviour of the petitioner.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that according to G.O.(Ms).No.10 dated 7th January 1994, no transfer could be effected within a period of three (3) years.

7. It is well settled principle of law that the transfer guidelines will not have a force of statute. Those guidelines have been issued to maintain a



WEB COPY

transparency. But, in the case on hand, the transfer is made on an administrative ground upon specific reasons as stated supra. Though the bad behaviour is the cause for transfer, such transfer by itself will not be construed as punitive, as the administration has go on smoothly. If the same person continues in the same place that will become a road block to set right the situation caused by the petitioner. Therefore, mere existence of the Government Order, will not bar the administration to transfer the petitioner.

8. In such view of the above legal position, this Court is of the firm view that whenever any transfer is made, the Writ Court should be slow in interfering the same otherwise, it would cause great difficulty to the administration. Apart from that, it is not the duty of the Court to micro manage the posting of Village Administrative Officer. From the submissions of the learned Additional Government Pleader, this Court is of the firm view that the *mala fide* intention, which is pleaded by the petitioner cannot be a true. Therefore, this Court finds that there is no merits in the present writ petition and the same is liable to be dismissed.



W.P No.13559 of 2025

WEB COPY

9. In the result, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently,
the connected miscellaneous petitions stand closed.

09.07.2025

ssi

Index : Yes

Speaking Order : Yes /No

Neutral Citation Case: Yes/No

To:

1.The District Collector,
Thiruvallur.

2.The Sub-Collector,
Ponneri,
Thiruvallur District.



WEB COPY



W.P No.13559 of 2025

C. KUMARAPPAN, J.

ssi

W.P.No.13559 of 2025

09.07.2025