



C.R.P.No.5349 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED: 06.01.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY**

C.R.P.No.5349 of 2024

and

C.M.P.No.29706 of 2024

D.Kanchana


... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Surcharge Officer,
Deputy Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
Vellore Zone, Vellore.
2. The Joint Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
Vellore Zone, Vellore.
3. The Joint Registrar/Managing Director,
Vellore District Central Cooperative Bank Limited,
Vellore.
4. The General Manager,
Vellore District Central Cooperative Bank Limited,
Vellore.

... Respondents

Prayer: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India to set aside the common Judgement and Decreetal order passed in Cooperative Tribunal/Principal District Court, Vellore District, in



C.R.P.No.5349 of 2024

C.M.A.(C.T.A) No.10 of 2021 dated 30.09.2024 confirming the Surcharge order in Na.Ka.No.941/2021 sapa (Tha.Thee.No.01/2021-2022 sapa) dated 01.09.2021 passed by the first respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Jayamalan
For R1 to R3 : Mr.M.Murali
Government Advocate
For R4 : Mr.D.Gopal
Government Advocate

ORDER

When the matter came up for hearing, it is submitted by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that arising out of the same proceedings, in respect of one J.Jayakumar, the connected Civil Revision petition in C.R.P.No.4618 of 2024 has been allowed.

2. When the charge pertains to the recovery of loan amount and there is no allegation with reference to misappropriation, this Court, after considering the very same charge in respect of the manager, concluded that there was no willful negligence or deliberate act. Therefore, the loss cannot be recovered through surcharge proceedings. The relevant portions of the said order from paragraph No. 6 to 10 are extracted here under:-



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.5349 of 2024

“6. As against the petitioner, enquiry was conducted under Section 81 of the Co-operative Societies Act on the ground that, after sanctioning of loan to the small traders, he has not taken any steps to recover the amount in time from the borrowers. It is not disputed that the revision petitioner was working as Branch Manager from 01.12.2011 to 31.08.2016 and during his tenure, he had sanctioned Small Traders loans to the tune of Rs.4,80,575/- to six persons and thereafter, he was transferred to the fourth respondent bank on 01.09.2016. Though he has not taken any steps immediately to recover the loan amount either by arbitration proceedings or some other proceedings, the facts remains that the revision petitioner was transferred on 01.09.2016 itself. As far as the recovery of the loan amount is concerned, though limitation is applicable, the proviso to Section 90(9) (b) of the Act clearly says that notwithstanding anything contained in the Act for limitation, the Registrar may admit the claim, if the applicant satisfies the Registrar that he had sufficient cause for not referring the dispute within such period and the dispute so admitted shall be a dispute which shall not be barred on the ground that the period of limitation has expired. In such circumstances, to fasten the liability on the person, the requirements for initiation of surcharge proceedings under Section 87 of the Act must be established; and the person must be acted in a manner of willful negligence to cause loss to the assets of the society. Therefore, mere inaction on the part of the employee would not suffice to proceed surcharge proceedings against that person.

7. At this juncture, it is worthwhile to note that, in the case of ***S.Ramadevi Vs. The Special Officer, Ambur Cooperative Sugar Mills,***



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.5349 of 2024

Vadapudupet, Vellore District and others reported in 2016 - 4 - L.W. 452 (W.A.No.1213 of 2008, dated 05.08.2016, arising out of the dispute with regard to the loss caused to the Society, in view of willful negligence on the part of the appellant, a Division Bench of this Court held as follows.

Issue No.3 : Willful negligence

25.The third and the last plea is actually the most crucial as to whether the appellant could be said to have acted with willful negligence. In this behalf, the learned counsel for the appellant has relied upon two judgments of this Court in S.Subramanian vs. The Deputy Registrar of Co-operative Societies (Housing), Cuddalore & others, 2002-3-L.W. 185, and K.Ajay Kumar Gosh and Others vs. Tribunal for Co-operative Cases, (2009) 4 MLJ 992, to contend that when requirements of Section 87 had not been satisfied, which warrants initiation of surcharge proceedings, the liability cannot be fastened. There has to be willful and wanton premeditation with a view to cause loss to the assets of the Society and "mere negligence cannot be a ground for surcharge and it must be willful negligence or intentional negligence and not mere carelessness or intention or inadvertence or a single lapse by oversight". We extract the observations in the case of K.Ajay Kumar Gosh, supra, as hereunder:

"19.A detailed discussion has been made by making reference to various judgments on this aspect in another judgment reported in Sathyamangalam Cooperative Urban Bank Ltd. vs. Deputy Registrar of Cooperative Society and Another, (1980) 2 MLJ 17, it is held thus:



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.5349 of 2024

"The degree of negligence that is contemplated under Section 71 (1) of the Tamil Nadu Cooperative Societies Act is not mere negligence, but wilful negligence. The word 'wilful' has not been defined in the Act. 'Wilfulness' or 'wantonness' imports pre-meditation or knowledge and consciousness that an injury or loss is likely to result from the act done or from the omission to act. It imports a constructive intention as to the consequences which, entering into the wilful act, the law imputes to the offender and in this way a charge, which otherwise would be mere negligence, becomes by reason of a reckless disregard of probable consequences, a wilful wrong. The act done or omitted to be done must be intended or must involve such reckless disregard of security and right as to imply bad faith. In examining whether there is wilful negligence, it has to be seen first whether the person concerned is guilty of negligence and if so, whether the said wilful negligence is the proximate cause of the injury or loss sustained."

20. In the light of the decisions referred to above, it is clear that to pass surcharge order under Section 87 of the Act, appellants should have done an actionable wrong either by commission or omission in a deliberate and reprehensible manner with reckless callousness and with a supine indifference, without taking due care and caution ordinarily expected from a reasonable and prudent man under those existing circumstances. In the absence of such categorical finding by the Respondents, it is not possible to mulct



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.5349 of 2024

the appellants with the loss caused to the society."

26. We are, thus, of the view that as the legal principles are quite settled, we have to only look into the application of the same in the facts of the present case. We are of the view that the appellate authority was right in coming to the conclusion that there is no willful negligence in the case of the appellant and this aspect has really not even been seriously touched upon by the learned Single Judge. Merely because loss is caused would not suffice. The appellant is not the beneficiary. There is no such willful negligence attributed to her. This is apparent from even the enquiry report, which we have referred to aforesaid. Mere use of the words "negligence and careless with selfish motive for

gain" would not suffice when actually the facts do not make out such a case. Thus, the surcharge officer certainly fell into an error in imposing the liability on the appellant. The enquiry report discussed aforesaid itself shows that it is the third respondent who is found to have taken advantage of the situation in seeking to obtain illegal gain for himself. The pay bill was prepared by the third respondent in the computer and the abstract of the department wise pay bill alone used to be furnished to the Accountant and the Chief Accountant (appellant) and signatures obtained. Thus, both of them had been signing on the department wise pay bill abstract without seeing the pay bills. The third respondent / Mr.A.Kabali, thus, took advantage of the fact that it was not possible for others to verify the cheques and test the salary list which was running into 300 pages. It is in these circumstances that the fourth



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.5349 of 2024

respondent has been exonerated of the liability even though the abstract pay bill was required to be verified by him as an Accountant and he alone was supervising each and every matter. The cheques signed by the appellant are actually in the nature of counter-signature and the Accountant himself had been exonerated. Merely because the appellant was the head of the department, the liability could not be fastened on her as no case of willful negligence is made out.

8. In the instant case, no evidence was adduced during the enquiry under Section 87 of the Act to prove the wilful negligence on the part of the civil revision petitioner. Further more, it is not established that there was willfull act in a deliberate manner by the civil revision petitioner, which was the cause for loss to the society. The respondents have not initiated any suit proceedings during his tenure. In such circumstances, mere negligence or inaction on the part of the petitioner, will not amount to willful negligence.

9. Inview of the foregoing discussion, this court is of the view that the respondents have not made out a case of willful negligence on the part of the petitioner to cause loss to the society and hence, the surcharge order passed by the first respondent and confirmed by the appellate authority are liable to be set aside.

10. Accordingly, this civil revision petition is allowed and the impugned order passed by the learned Principal District Judge, Cooperative Tribunal, Vellore in CMA (CTA) No.11/2021, dated 30.09.2024, confirming the surcharge order dated 01.09.2021 passed by the first respondent is set aside. There shall be no order as to costs. connected miscellaneous petition is closed.”

3. In view of the order passed in respect of the co-employee with



C.R.P.No.5349 of 2024

reference to the self same charge, this civil revision petition is also allowed on the same terms. Consequently, civil miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

06.01.2025

Neutral Citation: Yes/No
nsl

To

1. The Surcharge Officer,
Deputy Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
Vellore Zone, Vellore.
2. The Joint Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
Vellore Zone, Vellore.
3. The Joint Registrar/Managing Director,
Vellore District Central Cooperative Bank Limited,
Vellore.
4. The General Manager,
Vellore District Central Cooperative Bank Limited,
Vellore.

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.5349 of 2024

nsI

C.R.P.No.5349 of 2024

06.01.2025