



WEB COPY



W.P.No.28921 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 06.08.2025

CORAM
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

W.P.No.28921 of 2025
and
W.M.P.No.32462 of 2025

K.Ramesh

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Director of Land Reforms / Urban Land
Ceiling and Urban Land Tax,
Ezhilagam, Chepauk,
Chennai - 600 005.

2. The Assistant Commissioner,
Urban Land Tax,
Kancheepuram,
Kancheepuram District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India, seeking for an issuance of writ of mandamus, to direct the 1st respondent to replace the Enquiry Officer R.Nagalakshmi - the 2nd respondent to another capable person in respect of enquiry proceedings against the petitioner and further direct the petitioner be immediately reinstated at work during the pendency of the enquiry proceedings.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Raghuman
For Respondents : Mr.N.Naveen Kumar
Government Advocate



WEB COPY

W.P.No.28921 of 20



ORDER

By consent, the writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

2. The instant writ petition has been filed to direct the 1st respondent to replace the Enquiry Officer viz., R.Nagalakshmi, in respect of the departmental proceedings initiated against the petitioner.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner would submit that, the said Enquiry Officer / R.Nagalakshmi is junior to the petitioner and also as against the said Officer, the petitioner had given a complaint.

4. Learned Government Advocate on instructions from the Director of Land Reforms would submit that, the said Enquiry Officer was nine years senior to the petitioner. He would further submit that, the petitioner was appointed in service during the year 2009, whereas the Enquiry Officer was appointed during the year 2001 and apart from that, the Enquiry Officer was promoted to the post of Superintendent during the year 2015, whereas the petitioner was promoted to that post only during the year 2017.



W.P.No.28921 of 2

5. Heard the learned Counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

WEB COPY

6. The only contention raised by the petitioner is that, the Enquiry Officer is junior to the petitioner, which factum is proved to be wrong by the learned Government Advocate. Therefore, in view of the submission of the learned Government Advocate, this Court does not find any merits in the Writ Petition and stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

06.08.2025

veda

Index: Yes/No

Speaking order/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

To

1. The Director of Land Reforms / Urban Land Ceiling and Urban Land Tax,
Ezhilagam, Chepauk,
Chennai - 600 005.
2. The Assistant Commissioner,
Urban Land Tax,
Kancheepuram,
Kancheepuram District.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.28921 of 2

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

veda

W.P.No.28921 of 2025

06.08.2025