IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K. SURENDER

WP No. 41848 of 2016

K.Punithavel Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Secretary
The Commercial Tax and Registration
Department,
Secretariat Building, Chennai 9.

2.The Inspector General of
Registration, No.100, Santhome High
Road, Chennai 28

3.The Secretary
Tamil Nadu Public Service
Commission, Braser Bridge Road,
Chennai 3 Respondent(s)

PRAYER

This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India seeking Writ of Certiorari to call for the records of the impugned order passed by the 1st respondent vide G.O. No. 81/C.T. and Registration Department dated

09.03.2016 whereby confirming the punishment imposed by the 2nd respondent in his proceedings No. 44377/AA1/2011 dt 20.1.2012 and to quash the same.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. G.Thangavel

For Respondent(s): Mr.Stalin Abhimanyu AGP for R1 And R2
Mr.B.Vijay Standing for R3

ORDER

The petitioner has filed this Writ Petition seeking to quash the impugned order passed by the first respondent vide G.O. No. 81/C.T and Registration Department dated 09.03.2016, which confirmed the punishment imposed by the second respondent in his proceedings No. 44377/AA1/2011 dated 20.01.2012.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner, while functioning as an Assistant in the V Section of the Officer Inspector General of Registration, was found irresponsible for delaying action on a letter dated 13.12.2010 received from the Trichy District Registrar. The delay of nine months in acting upon the letter was deemed a violation of Rule 20 of the Government Servant Conduct Rules.

3. After issuing a charge memo and receiving the petitioner's explanation vide letter dated 14.11.2011, an enquiry was conducted. The main contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner's explanation was not considered. However, the order of Inspector General of Registration reveals that the explanation regarding the charge of delay was discussed and found contrary to the office procedural rules. The disciplinary authority held that the petitioner had acted negligently and irresponsibly.

4. The relevant extract from the order of the Inspector General of Registration reads as under:

> *" The reasons put forth in the explanation of the charged official are contrary to the office procedural rules. It has been established that the charged officials has acted negligently and irrespectively in handling confidential and highly important files. However, on compassionate consideration, as punishment for the proved charge, it is hereby ordered that the next increment of the charged official shall be stopped for one year without cumulative*

effect.

This punishment shall not take effect from the date of his next increment. If the charged official proceed on leave during the period of punishment, such leave shall not be reckoned as part of the punishment period. Further, this punishment shall not affect his pensionary benefits.

The charged official is required to acknowledge receipt of this order....."

5. On a perusal of the above order, it reveals that the explanation of the petitioner was considered and a finding was given against him. Therefore, the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that his explanation was not examined is incorrect. Hence, I do not find any reason to interfere with the findings of the disciplinary authority and subsequent Appellate Authority.

6. In view of the above discussions, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

K.SURENDER, J.
17-11-2025

Jai
Index:Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet:Yes
Neutral Citation:Yes/No

To

1.The Secretary
The Commercial Tax and Registration
Department, Secretariat Building,
Chennai 9

2.The Inspector General of
Registration, No.100, Santhome High
Road, Chennai 28

3.The Secretary
Tamil nadu Public Service
Commission, Braser Bridge Road,
Chennai 3

K.SURENDER, J.

jai

WP No. 41848 of 2016

17-11-2025