



W.A No. 3324 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13.11.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE R.SURESH KUMAR

AND

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR

W.A No.3324 of 2025

and

C.M.P.No.27177 of 2025

1. The Director General of Police
Santhome, Chennai-600 004.
2. The Superintendent of Police
Dharmapuri District.
3. The Superintendent of Police
Railways, Chennai.

..Appellants

Vs

Madhuraj
S/o.Ponnan

..Respondent

Writ Appeal is filed under Clause 15 of Letter Patent to set aside the order dated 27.07.2023 made in W.P.No.42723 of 2016 and allow the writ appeal.

For Appellants : Mr.E.Veda Bagath Singh
Special Government Pleader

J U D G M E N T



W.A No. 3324 of 2025

WEB COPY

(Made by **HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR, J.**)

The challenge in this intra-Court Appeal is to the order dated 27.07.2023 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P. No. 42723 of 2016. By the said order, the learned Single Judge modified the punishment of reduction of pay by two stages for two years with cumulative effect to one without cumulative effect.

2. The respondent/writ petitioner, while working as a Police Constable (Armed Reserve), Railways, Dharmapuri District, was issued a charge memo for indiscipline and slackness in sentry duty. It was alleged that he had fallen into a deep sleep, as a result of which his cell phone went missing from the charger. It was further alleged that he had stripped off the clothes of two home guards, presuming them to be responsible for the loss of his cell phone. A departmental enquiry was conducted against the respondent/writ petitioner, culminating in the imposition of the punishment of reduction of pay by two stages with cumulative effect.

3. The learned Single Judge interfered with the punishment to the extent stated above. Aggrieved thereby, the present writ appeal has been filed.

4. We have heard Mr. E. Veda Bagath Singh, learned counsel for the



W.A No. 3324 of 2025

appellants, and perused the materials on record.

5. The learned Single Judge, after taking into consideration the nature of the charges and the fact that the respondent/writ petitioner is still in service and would have probably realized the discipline expected of him, considered it appropriate to interfere with the punishment. The learned Single Judge retained the punishment of reduction of pay by two stages for two years but modified it to operate without cumulative effect instead of with cumulative effect. The learned Single Judge, in exercise of discretionary jurisdiction, passed the impugned order modifying the punishment.

6. In such circumstances, the impugned order cannot be said to be arbitrary or perverse, and in the absence of any infirmity, the order passed by the learned Single Judge does not suffer from any illegality or warrant interference.

R. SURESH KUMAR, J.

and

HEMANT CHANDANGOUDAR, J.,



WEB COPY



W.A No. 3324 of 2025

mk

7. In the light of the above, we find no merits in this appeal. Accordingly, the Writ Appeal is dismissed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(R.S.K.,J)

(H.C., J)

13.11.2025

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes/No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

mk

W.A No. 3324 of 2025