



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on	04.08.2025
Pronounced on	10.10 .2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI

S.A.No.1251 of 2019

V.Vilvanathan

...Appellant

Vs.

1.The Commandant,
Arohan Mukhyalaya,
Embarkation Headquarters,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009

2.The Deputy Director General,
Quartermaster General Branch
Canteen Services
Ministry of Defence,
Army Headquarters,
New Delhi- 110 001.

...Respondents

Prayer : Second Appeal filed under Section 100 CPC, to set aside the decree and judgment dated 11.01.2018 passed in A.S. No.126 of 2017, on the file of the XVI Additional City Civil Court, Chennai, confirming the

Page 1 of 28



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

Judgment and decree dated 18.01.2017 passed in O.S. No.744 of 2014, on the file of the I Additional City Civil Court, Chennai.

For Appellant : M/s.S.Sadasharam

**For Respondents :Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan,
Additional Solicitor General
for Mr.Venkataswamy Baby for R1 & R2**

JUDGMENT

The second appeals arise out of the judgment and decree dated 11.01.2018 passed in A.S.No.126 of 2017 on the file of the XVI Additional City Civil Court, Chennai, confirming the judgment and decree dated 18.01.2017 in O.S. No.744 of 2014 on the file of the I Assistant City Civil Court, Chennai.

2.This second appeal has been preferred by the unsuccessful plaintiff. The suit was filed by the plaintiff for declaring that the impugned order of termination dated 30.10.2013 is illegal and non-est in law and for mandatory injunction directing the 1st respondent to reinstate the plaintiff into service with service benefits like seniority, pay protection with arrears of salary and allowances from 30.10.2013 and for cost. The suit was



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY

dismissed on 18.01.2017. Challenging the same, an appeal was preferred in A.S.No.126 of 2017 before XVI Additional City Civil Court, Chennai. The said appeal was also dismissed on 11.01.2018. Aggrieved by this, the present second appeal has been preferred by the plaintiff.

3.The case of the plaintiff is that by order dated 27.03.2007 he was appointed as store keeper and ADLR at Unit Run Canteen, Embarkation Headquarters, Chennai. The appellant/plaintiff has completed more than five years of service and the appellant/plaintiff's appointment was confirmed as storekeeper on completion of the probation period and the appellant/plaintiff had been discharging his duties diligently and honestly and by virtue of his hard work he had secured more collections to the canteen. By way of show cause notice dated 05.07.2013 the appellant/plaintiff was called upon the respondents/defendants to give explanation as to why he was using the smart card illegally for purchase of grocery rather than returning the smart card to OIC URC or Canteen Manager or Accounts Office, finding that the smart card was used by one Kamalakannan of Rail Branch of Embarkation Headquarters, Chennai and his card was lost during December 2011. The appellant/plaintiff has given a



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY suitable reply dated 06.07.2013 explaining the circumstances.

3.1. While so, the respondent/defendant issued another show cause notice on 03.10.2013 stating that the Court of inquiry was conducted and consequent to the findings of the Court of inquiry it was found that the appellant/plaintiff had been using the lost smart card of Kamalakkan of Rail Branch, Embarkation Headquarters, Chennai and the appellant/plaintiff was called upon to explain in writing as to why disciplinary action should not be initiated and the services of the appellant/plaintiff should not be terminated with immediate effect. On receipt of the said show cause notice the appellant/plaintiff gave an explanation on 11.10.2013 denying the allegations levelled against him and explained the facts and circumstances of the case in which the smart card was involved and also requested to grant leave for one more month from 03.10.2013 to 01.11.2013 so that the appellant/plaintiff can give adequate medical treatment and protection to his wife, who was suffering from ailment. In spite of the explanation offered by the appellant/plaintiff, no charges were framed against the appellant/plaintiff nor any disciplinary action was initiated and he was not



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY found guilty of any misconduct. However, quite contrary to the mandatory provisions of the rule and regulating the terms and conditions of canteen services dated 28.04.2003 the appellant/plaintiff was terminated from service as storekeeper from the 1st respondent/defendant establishment and aggrieved against the same the appellant/plaintiff has filed this suit. The impugned termination order has been referred by the respondent/defendant in letter dated 14.09.2001 to Army Headquarters and the letter dated 28.04.2003 of Army Headquarters. Whereas, the letter dated 14.09.2001 is not in operation as the same had been suppressed. Hence this suit.

4.On the other hand, the defendant submits that the appellant/plaintiff was appointed as storekeeper cum ADLR Clerk at Unit run Canteen with effect from 01.07.2007. He was warned on several occasions on account of indiscipline/negligence of duty and inappropriate conduct. On 05.07.2013 it has brought to the notice of Officer-in-charge, Unit Run Canteen that the individual was caught using lost Smart Card No. GC05040595725800J00 in an unauthorised manner, belonging to UDC K.Kamalakaran of Rail Branch, Embarkation Headquarters. The findings of the Court of Inquiry



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY

beyond doubt established that the appellant/plaintiff was guilty of possessing the lost smart card of UDC K.Kamalakannan and intentionally misusing it for his personal benefits in an unauthorised manner. Hence, a show cause notice was issued to the appellant / plaintiff on 03.10.2013 and the misconduct of the appellant / plaintiff was proceeded and all rules/regulations, regulating the terms and conditions of Canteen Services dated 28.04.2003 was strictly adhered to and his services were terminated on 30.10.2013 in the interest of the organisation and in the termination order, a reference is made to both the letters. Though the letter dated 14.09.2001 had been superseded, it has been referred to primarily as in his appointment letter of 27.04.2017, with regard to the terms and conditions of his service. Since it is a defence organisation, wherein, discipline and integrity is of paramount importance. Hence the suit is liable to be dismissed.

5.The trial Court dismissed the suit on the ground that as per the rules and conditions of Civilian Employees of Unit Run Canteen, the plaintiff has to approach the appropriate Appellate Authority to seek remedy against the



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY order of the Disciplinary Authority. The First Appellate Court confirmed the judgment and decree passed by the trial Court.

6.The learned counsel appearing for the Appellant/plaintiff submits that the order of termination issued against the plaintiff is without any basis and the same is illegal and against law. He would further submit that the order of termination dated 30.10.2013 has been passed without any jurisdiction and authority, by the 1st respondent appointing authority and therefore, the same is liable to be set aside. His further contention is that the jurisdiction of the Civil Court is not ousted by any express provisions in the rules and regulations dated 28.04.2003 issued governing the service conditions of the employees of Unit Run Canteen (herein after referred as ' URC '). He would submit that the employees of URC who were terminated from service without any authority and jurisdiction have challenged the order of termination by filing civil suit and got the order of termination set aside with a direction to reinstate them into service with all consequential service benefits. The learned counsel for the appellant would submit that the rules regulating the terms and conditions of service of Civilian Employees of Air Force Unit Run Canteen are paid out of Non Public Funds and



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY

therefore, the employee of Unit Run Canteen in Air Force are not Government employees. Hence, the matter relating to the service of URC employees, the Civil Court jurisdiction is not ousted when the relevant service Rules neither expressly nor by implication have taken away jurisdiction of civil Court to deal with service matter. While so, the Courts below have committed grave error by stating that the Civil Court jurisdiction is ousted without deciding the matter on merits. To support his contention, he has relied upon the judgment reported in ***AIR 2010 Supreme Court 188***. Hence, prayed for setting aside the judgement and decree passed by the Courts below.

7.On the other hand, the learned Additional Solicitor General appearing for the respondents 1 & 2 would submit that the plaintiff was charged for using the lost Smart Card Number in an unauthorized manner belonging to UDC K.Kamalakannan of Rail Branch, Embarkation Headquarters. Hence, the plaintiff was served with show cause notice and thereafter a Court of inquiry was ordered by the Commandant, Embarkation Headquarters. The plaintiff was found guilty and a show cause notice was issued to the plaintiff on 03.10.2013. The misconduct of the plaintiff was



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY proceeded and all Rules/Regulations regulating the terms and conditions of

Canteen services dated 28.04.2003 was strictly followed and he was terminated from service on 30.10.2013 in the interest of the Organization.

He would further submit that as per the provisions of law, if an employee is removed from the service or terminated from the service or disciplinary action is taken against the employee, he should approach the Central Administrative Tribunal and hence the Civil Court jurisdiction is ousted.

His further contention is that the URC employees are the employees under Government and only the Central Administrative Tribunal is having jurisdiction to try the matters relating to the employees. To support his contention, the learned counsel has relied upon the judgment in ***Union of India and other Vs. M.Asalam and others*** reported in ***(2001 AIR SCW 134)***.

8.Heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

9.First and foremost question to be addressed in the instant case is the status of the employees of URCs. It is not in dispute that the plaintiff is an employee of URCs in the Air Force. What is the status of URCs is no



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY longer res-integra. Earlier the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Union of India Vs. Mohd. Aslam***, reported in ***2001(1) SCC 720*** held that employees of URCs are Government servants, however, doubting the correctness of the view, a Three Judges Bench decided the issue in the matter of ***R.R. Pillai (dead) through Lrs. Vs. Commanding Officer Head Quarter S.A.C (U) & Ors.***, reported in ***(2009) 13 SCC 311*** and ***Union of India Vs. Dayalu Ram***, reported in ***(2019) 1 Scale 352***. The relevant discussion of the same is reproduced as hereunder:

9. In the case of Aslam's case (supra) a Bench of this court proceeded on incorrect factual premises inasmuch as after noticing that the URCs are not funded from the Consolidated Fund of India, it went wrong in concluding that the URCs are funded by CSD as well as the articles were supplied by the CSD. Unfortunately, it did not notice that no such funding is made by the CSD. Further, only refundable loans can be granted by the CSD to URCs at the rate of interest laid down by it from time to time upon the application of URCs seeking financial assistance. URCs can also take from other Non- Public Funds.

10. Further observation regarding supply is also not correct.



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY *URCs, in fact, purchase articles from CSD depots and it is not an automatic supply and relation between URCs and CSDs is that of buyer and seller and not of principal and the agent. This Court further went wrong in holding that URCs are parts of CSDs when it has been clearly stated that URCs are purely private ventures and their employees are by no stretch of imagination employees of the Government or CSD.*

11. Additionally, in Aslam's case (supra) reference was made to Parimal Chandra Raha and Ors. V. LIC. The Bench hearing the matter unfortunately did not notice that there was no statutory obligation on the part of the Central Government to provide canteen services to its employees. The profits generated from the URCs are not credited to the Consolidated Funds, but are distributed to the Non Public Funds which are used by the units for the welfare of the troops. As per para 1454 of the Regulations for the Air Force, 1964 the losses incurred by the non public funds are not to be borne by the State.

12. The factors highlighted to distinguish Chotelal's case in our considered opinion are without any material. There was no scope for making any distinction factually between



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY *Aslam's case and Chotelelal's case. In our view, therefore, Aslam's case was not correctly decided.*

13. The question whether the URC can be treated as an instrumentality of the State does not fall for consideration as that aspect has not been considered by CAT or the High Court. Apparently, on that score alone we could have dismissed the appeal. But we find that the High Court placed reliance on Rule 24 to deny the effect of the appointment.

14. From Rule 4 read with Rule 2 it is clear classification that all employees are first on probation and they shall be treated as temporary employees. After completion of five years they might be declared as permanent employees. They do not get the status of the Government employees at any stage. In Aslam's case CAT's order was passed in 1995. By that time 1999 Rules were not in existence and 1984 rules were operative.

15. It is to be noted that financial assistance is given, but interest and penal interest are charged. The URCs can also borrow from financial institutions. The reference is answered by holding that employees of URCs are not government



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY *servants.*

16. The High Court has come to an abrupt conclusion about validity of Rule 24, distinguishing the decision of this Court in DTC v. D.T.C. Mazdoor Congress. The Present appellant had questioned validity of Rule 24. High Court should have considered that challenge in the proper perspective. But it is not necessary to examine that question as the original employee R.R. Pillai has already expired. But, in the peculiar facts of the case we direct that a sum of Rs.2 lakhs be paid to his legal representatives within a period of three months in full and final settlement of all his claims.

11. Later on, in the case of Dayalu Ram (supra), the Apex Court affirmed the view taken in the case of R.R. Pillai (supra), which is reproduced as under :-.

9. The position of Unit Run Canteens of the Indian Army is no longer res integra following the decision of the three Judge Bench in R.R. Pillai. The reference to the Bench of three Judges was occasioned as a result of a doubt having been cast on an earlier decision of a two-Judge Bench in Union of India versus M. Aslam. The Bench of three Judges



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY *observed that despite noticing that Unit run Canteens are not funded from the Consolidated Fund of India, the two Judge Bench in M. Aslam erroneously held that these canteens are funded by the Canteen Stores Department (CSD). In R.R. Pillai after reviewing the position of regimental canteens, this Court held that the employees have not been granted the status of government employees at any stage. Hence the reference was answered by holding that employees of the Unit run Canteens are not Government employees. This decision has been followed in a subsequent decision in Gobinda Prasad Mula."*

10. Therefore, the Hon'ble Apex Court answered the reference by holding that employees of the URCs are not Government employees. Hence, the terms and conditions of service of Canteen employees are covered by the rules called "The Rules regulating the Terms and Conditions of Service of Civilian Employees of Air Force Unit Run Canteen paid out of Non-Public Funds". There is no express provision in the rules and regulations dated 28.04.2003 ousting the Civil Court jurisdiction. Hence, the Civil Court jurisdiction is not ousted.



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY 11. The next contention of the learned counsel for the appellant/plaintiff is that in the absence of any provisions providing for termination from service, the authorities of the URC have no jurisdiction to pass the order of termination as a punishment against the appellant/plaintiff without conducting any enquiry as contemplated under the provisions of the Rules and Regulations dated 28.04.2003. He would further submit that the respondents / defendants have neither followed proper legal procedures nor the principles of natural justice, in terminating the service of the appellant. According to him, the action taken against the appellant/plaintiff and the termination order are penal in nature, however, no charge memo was issued on the appellant, no explanation was called for from him and without providing opportunity to raise his defence, terminated him from service. Hence, the action taken by the Respondents are not legally sustainable. The learned counsel for the appellant would submit that the termination of the appellant/plaintiff is against law, there is no other go for the appellant except to file a civil suit in O.S.No.744 of 2014 on the file of the I Assistant City Civil Court Judge, Chennai and that there is no express provision in the Rules and Regulations dated 28.04.2003 ousting the Civil Court



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY

jurisdiction and therefore, the Civil Suit filed by the appellant/plaintiff is legally maintainable. The learned counsel further referred to Rule 33 of the Rules framed and issued on 28.04.2003 regulating the terms and conditions of service of civilian employees of URC paid out of Non-Public Fund which reads as follows:

"Any legal dispute arising between the employee and employer will be submitted to jurisdiction of local courts."

12.A perusal of the aforesaid rules would clearly establish that any legal dispute arising between the appellant/plaintiff and respondents/defendants, i.e., employee and employer respectively, the Competent Court having jurisdiction would be the local Civil Courts, normally the Civil Court vested with the territorial and pecuniary jurisdiction.

13.In ***Ramendra Kishore Biswas Vs. State of Tirupura***, reported in ***AIR 1999 SC 294***, a three Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as follows:

" 5... *Indeed, it is appropriate to relegate a*



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY

person to exhaust Departmental remedies when he approaches the Court without exhausting Departmental remedies under the Service Rules but to hold that the Civil Court had no jurisdiction while hearing a second appeal, after the matter has been litigated in Civil Courts for more than five years was, to say the least, not proper. The learned single Judge ought to have decided the case on its own merits and not made a short cut of it. The appellant could not have been non-suited on the ground that he had failed to take recourse to proceedings under the C.C.5 (C.C and A) Rules 1965 against the order of dismissal."

In the decision, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has further held that as a matter of fact, it was appeared to them that the single Judge had failed to exercise the jurisdiction, vested with him, while non suiting the appellant. On the aforesaid grounds, it was held as appropriate to allow the appeal, setting aside the order of the learned single Judge and remit the matter back to the High Court for fresh decision of the regular Second Appeal and the cross-objections on their own



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY

merits. It has been categorically held by the Threes Judge Bench of the Apex Court that the civil Court is vested with the jurisdiction, accordingly, the High Court has to dispose the second appeal on merits. The aforesaid decision is directly applicable to the present second appeals.

21. In Dharma Nand vs. Union of India, reported in 2004 SCC (L&S) 1034, relying on Union of India vs. M.Asalam, reported in (2001) 1 SCC 720, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that canteen employees under the defence ministry were to be treated as Government servants.

14. In the light of the decisions rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court referred to above, this Court is of the view that the suit filed by the respondents are maintainable in law and the Civil Court has jurisdiction to decide the same, according to law and the plea of the respondent that the civil court has got no jurisdiction is not sustainable in law.



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY

15. According to the appellant/ plaintiff, he was appointed to the post of Storekeeper and ADLR at Unit Run Canteen Embarkation Headquarters, Chennai, by order dated 27.03.2007 and the scale of pay was fixed at Rs.4,000/- with effect from 01.04.2007. While so, a show cause notice dated 05.07.2013 was issued and the plaintiff was called upon by the defendant to give explanation as to why the plaintiff was using the smart card illegally for purchase of grocery rather than returning the smart card to OIC URC or Canteen Manager or Accounts office finding that the smart card was used by one Kamalakannan of Rail Branch of Embarkation Headquarters, Chennai and his card was lost during December 2011. For the said show cause notice dated 05.07.2013 the plaintiff has given a suitable reply. While so, the defendant issued another show cause notice on 03.10.2013 whereby it was stated that the Court of Inquiry was conducted and consequent to the findings of the Court of Inquiry it was found that on 05.07.2013 the plaintiff had been using the lost smart card of Kamala Kannan of Rail Branch, Embarkation Headquarters, Chennai and the plaintiff was called upon to explain in writing as to why disciplinary action



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY

should not be initiated and the services of the plaintiff should not be terminated with immediate effect. On receipt of the said show cause notice the plaintiff gave an explanation on 11.10.2013 denying the allegations levelled against the plaintiff and also explained the facts and circumstances of the case in which the smart card was involved. In spite of the explanation offered by the plaintiff, no charges were framed against the plaintiff nor any disciplinary action was initiated and he was not found guilty of any misconduct. However, quite contrary to the mandatory provisions of the rules and regulations regulating the terms and conditions of Canteen Services dated 28.04.2003 the plaintiff was terminated from service as storekeeper from the 1st defendant's establishment and aggrieved against the same, the plaintiff has filed the above suit for declaration that the order dated 30.10.2013 served on the plaintiff on 01.11.2013 is illegal and non est in law. It is stated that in the impugned termination order dated 30.10.2013 which is punitive in nature, the defendant has referred to the letters dated 14.09.2001 and 28.04.2003 of Army Headquarters. Whereas, the letter dated 14.09.2001 is not in operation as the same had been superseded and that the impugned order of termination is in violation of the mandatory provisions



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY of Rules and Regulations dated 28.04.2003 besides being punitive in nature and content and Rules and Regulations do not provide for any termination and no disciplinary action was initiated against the plaintiff and he was not found guilty of any misconduct and therefore the order of termination issued against the plaintiff is illegal and against law and most untenable and as such the plaintiff is entitled to be reinstated into service with all consequential service benefits. The order of termination dated 30.10.2013 has been malafidely and arbitrarily issued.

16.It is not in dispute that the respondents/defendants were empowered to take appropriate disciplinary action against the appellant/plaintiff, in case of proved misconduct, including removal/dismissal of the employee from service. But, it is mandatory on the part of the respondents/defendants to follow the procedures as per the terms and conditions of the service of the employees, otherwise it would be an arbitrary action, legally not sustainable. Paragraph No.41 of the terms and conditions of service, for taking action dealing with case of misconduct, reads as follows:



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY

41. Before awarding to an employee any of the punishments mentioned in para 30-C and 39, the following procedure shall be followed by the disciplinary authority:

a) The employee is to be served with a charge sheet, clearly stating the imputation of misconduct against him and calling upon him to show CAUSE as to why one or more of the punishments included in those guidelines should not be awarded to him.

b) The reply to the charge sheet, if any, is to be duly considered by the disciplinary authority.

c) If the employee so desires, he is to be heard in person and is also to be allowed to cross examine witness(es) against him or procedure witnesses in his defence. The disciplinary procedure is laid down in Appendix "B".

17.Further, if there is any adverse order, the affected employee is



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

entitled to prefer appeal. The appellate authority may either *suo moto* or on appeal from an individual, review any order of the disciplinary authority and on such review, pass any order or issue any direction it deems fit on the facts and circumstance of the case. The appellate authority shall be the authority superior in the chain of command.

18.In the instant case, there is nothing on record to show that charge memo was issued on the appellant/plaintiff. There is no material on record to show that explanation was called for and opportunity was given to the appellant/plaintiff. Since, the respondents/defendants remained ex-parte, the appellant/plaintiff had no opportunity to cross examine any witness of the respondents/defendants in this regard. Moreover, it is not established that the respondents/defendants have followed the procedures contemplated under the rules for terminating the appellant/plaintiff. The respondents/defendants ought to have issued charge memo, calling for explanation and if the explanation is not satisfactory, after framing of charges, enquiry ought to have been conducted in accordance with law by following the principles of natural justice. Therefore, there is nothing on



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

record to show that the respondents/defendants have followed the mandatory procedures.

19.In *Dharma Nan vs. Union of India*, reported in *2004 SCC (I & S) 1034*, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that the termination of the Canteen employees were illegal, on the ground that the mandatory procedures were not followed by the appropriate authority and the impugned order was violative of principles of natural justice.

20.The First appellate Court came to the conclusion and dismissed the suit against the appellant/plaintiff. The appellant/plaintiff has clearly denied the allegations levelled against him. In spite of his denial the respondents/defendants have issued the notice of termination, which is illegal. There is nothing on record to show that enquiry was conducted and in pursuant to the enquiry, the punitive termination order was issued on 30.10.2013. On perusal of the rules, it is seen that while laying procedure for dealing with the case of misconduct it is provided that the delinquent shall be served with the charge sheet clearly stating that the details of mis



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY

conduct against him. But in this case it is not made clear whether any charge sheet is served upon the delinquent and further clause "C" of Rule 24 lays down "if the employee so desires, he is to be heard in person and is also to be allowed to cross examine witness or witnesses against him or produce witnesses in his defence" and further perusal shows that the disciplinary procedure is laid down for "dismissal/ discharge" as described in Appendix "B" wherein also holding of any inquiry is made mandatory. But in this case though on the side of the appellant it is alleged that no enquiry was conducted nor any opportunity was given to the appellant/plaintiff to state his defence, the respondents 1 and 2 have not taken any care to appear before the trial court and refute stating that the appellant was given an opportunity by holding an enquiry to defend his case. Under the circumstances, in the absence of any denial by the respondents/defendants that, it is to be presumed that no opportunity was given to the appellant/plaintiff to defend his case, which is mandatory one as laid down under the rules and regulations of service of Civilian Employees of Unit Run Canteen paid out of non public fund. So as discussed above, it is decided that the above procedural lapse is fatal to the



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

WEB COPY

proceedings and against the law and procedure laid down under rules and regulations governing the service of Civilian Employees of Unit Run Canteen paid out of non public fund. The respondents/defendants have failed to conduct any enquiry into the matter as contemplated under the mandatory provisions of rules governing for termination of service of the appellant/plaintiff who was permanently employed in time scale of pay in the respondent's/defendant's Unit Run Service Canteen, which is a violation of principles of natural justice and consequently the appellant/plaintiff is entitled to be reinstated into service with all consequential service benefits. There is no reason whatsoever for the respondents/defendants to fail to follow the rules and regulations governing the service conditions of the appellant/plaintiff and the failure to adopt legal procedure contemplated under the rules governing the service conditions of the appellant/plaintiff tells on the validity of the order of termination.

21.Hence, the Courts below erred in dismissing the suit filed by the appellant /plaintiff without considering the same on merits. Hence, the judgment and decree passed by the first Appellate Court is set aside. The



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

second appeal in S.A.No.1251 of 2019 is allowed without cost and the suit in O.S.No.744/2014 is decreed. The respondents / defendants are directed to reinstate the appellant / plaintiff into service with benefits like seniority, pay protection with arrears of salary and allowances from 30.10.2013.

10.10.2025

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-Speaking order
vsn

To

1. The XVI Additional City Civil Court, Chennai,
2. The I Additional City Civil Court, Chennai.
3. The Section Officer, VR Section, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



S.A.No.1251 of 2019

K.GOVINDARAJAN THILAKAVADI,J.
vsn

Pre- delivery judgment made in
S.A.No.1251 of 2019

10.10.2025