



WEB COPY



W.P.No.19912 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.06.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

W.P.No.19912 of 2025
and
W.M.P.No.22456 of 2025

P.Saravanan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd.,
Rep. By its Managing Director,
Tower-II, 4th Floor, Gandhi Irwin Bridge Road,
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.
2. The Senior Regional Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd.,
Trichy.
3. The District Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd.,
Villupuram.
4. S.Anandhan
5. K.Seenuvasan

... Respondents



W.P.No.19912 of 2025

WEB COPY

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records pertaining to the order dated 27.09.2024 in Na.Ka.No.A1/552/412/2024 and the order dated 07.05.2025 in Na.Ka.No.C.V/A1/552/2025, quash the same consequently direct the first to third respondents to restore and repost the petitioner as main supervisor with full charge at shop No.11412 and to treat the period from 14.05.2025 to 29.05.2025 as duty pay and all other consequential benefits, award costs.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Ajoy Khose

For Respondents : Ms.V.S.Saranya,
Standing Counsel (for R1 to R3)

ORDER

The instant writ petition has been filed challenging the transfer order dated 07.05.2025 passed by third respondent.

2. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents would invite the attention of this Court to the fact that the impugned order has been passed in pursuance of the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.36466 of 2024 dated 16.04.2025.



W.P.No.19912 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. As a reply to the above submission, the learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that since the petitioner had preferred a review petition, he is entitled to challenge the impugned order of transfer. It is a well-settled principle of law that the only ground to challenge the transfer is malafide.

4. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the first to third respondents and perused the materials available on record.

5. Here, on perusal of the impugned order, he simply complied with the directions of this Court passed in W.P.No.36466 of 2024 dated 16.04.2025. Therefore, this Court does not find any infirmity in the transfer order passed by the third respondent. However, this Court makes it clear that the petitioner has preferred a review petition against the impugned order. The petitioner is at liberty to challenge the impugned order subject to the order passed in the review petition.



W.P.No.19912 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. In the result, this Writ Petition is dismissed. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed. No costs.

04.06.2025

kv

Index : Yes/No

Speaking order /Non Speaking Order

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

To

1. The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd.,
Tower-II, 4th Floor, Gandhi Irwin Bridge Road,
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.
2. The Senior Regional Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd.,
Trichy.
3. The District Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Ltd.,
Villupuram.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.19912 of 2025

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

kv

W.P.No.19912 of 2025

04.06.2025