



WEB COPY

WP No. 4772 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 12-02-2026**

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN**

**WP No. 4772 of 2026**

T.G. Vasantha @ Kamatchi,

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Registrar of Co-operative Societies  
N.V.N.Malaigai, Kilpauk, Chennai 600 10.
2. The Joint Registrar of Co-operaive Societies,  
Krishnagiri Region, Krishangiri District.
3. The Deputy Registrar of  
Co- operative Societies, Hosure circle, Hosur,  
Krishnagiri District 635 109.
4. K.K.136, Thorapalli Primary Agricultural Co-  
operative Credit Society Ltd.,  
Rep. by its Administrator, Thorapalli Post,  
Hosur Taluk, Krishangiri District 635109.
5. C.Kamalesan,  
Secretary, K.K.136, Thorapalli Primary  
Agricultural Co- Operative Credit Society Ltd.,  
Thorapalli Post, Hosur Taluk, Krishangiri  
District 635109.

..Respondent(s)

**Prayer:** This writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ of Mandamus to direct the respondents 1 and 2 herein to consider the representation dated 21.12.2025 made by the petitioner



herein.

For Petitioner(s) : Mr.T.Sundaravadanam  
For Respondent(s) : Mr.V.Umakanth, GA  
for RR1 to 3

Mr.L.S.M.Hasan Fizal, AGP for  
Mr.A.M.Ayyadurai, GA for R4

### **ORDER**

Mr.V.Umakanth, Government Advocate accepts notice for the first respondent and Mr.L.S.M.Hasan Fizal, Additional Government Pleader accepts notice for Mr.Ayyadurai, Government Advocate for the fourth respondent.

2. In view of the nature of the order being passed, notice to the fifth respondent is dispensed with.

3. The petitioner is a member of the fourth respondent Primary Agricultural Co-operative Credit Society. She had availed a loan to the tune of Rs.11,58,000/- She paid her share of amount for Rs.1,10,000/-. By virtue of certain Government Orders the loans stood waived. It is her plea that, the fifth respondent, who is the Secretary of the Society, adjusted a sum of Rs.80,675/- towards a crop loan, which she had never availed. She lodged a complaint with the respondents 1 to 3 alleging that she had never taken the loans and the fifth respondent had pocketed the money, which rightfully belongs to her, by creating false records as if she had taken a crop loan. An administrative enquiry



seems to have been conducted on this basis by the second respondent.

WEB COPY

4. He had enquired with the petitioner and the fifth respondent and submitted a report. This was on the basis of the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.3761 of 2025 dated 06.02.2025 directing the authorities to consider the representation made by the petitioner on 18.11.2024.

5. Today, The petitioner is before this Court seeking for another direction to consider her representation dated 21.12.2025 made on the basis of the orders passed by the second respondent. The petitioner has sought for a two-fold plea. One to take action against the fifth respondent for the alleged illegality committed by him in pocketing a sum of Rs.80,675/- and adjusting the same against a non-existing crop loan said to have been availed by the petitioner and two, to refund the amount of Rs.80,675/- which has been illegally deducted from her member share.

6. Insofar as the first portion is concerned, it is up to the fourth respondent whether it wants to take action against its employee for the alleged malversation. This is not a public interest litigation, calling upon the respondents, to initiate action against their servant.

7. The entire grievance of the petitioner is, the amounts due to her has



been unauthorisedly deducted by the society through the fifth respondent. This is the nature of a dispute between the petitioner and the respondents 4 and 5.

Whether the petitioner took a crop loan or whether the crop loan records had been manipulated by the fifth respondent are matters which requires evidence.

8. All that the petitioner has today is, an administrative order. An administrative order cannot mulct a person with civil liabilities, especially, when there is a specific provision in the Co-operative Societies Act which deals in the manner in which the dispute between a member and a society have to be dealt with. Hence, the third respondent can treat the application filed by the petitioner on 21.12.2025 as a petition under Section 90 of Co-operative Societies Act raising a dispute between the petitioner and the fourth respondent. The third respondent shall exercise the statutory powers under Section 90, conduct an enquiry after due notice and pass an award within a period of three (3) months from today.

9. Insofar as the recommendation made by the second respondent to the third respondent to conduct a statutory inspection under Section 82 of the Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act, in case, no action is initiated it is for the first respondent to step in and ensure that the matters proceed in a manner known to law.



WEB COPY

10. With the above observation, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

**12-02-2026**

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

rap

To

1. The Registrar of Co-Op Societies  
N.V.N.Malaigai, Kilpauk, Chennai 600 10.
2. The Joint Registrar of Co-operative Societies,  
Krishnagiri Region, Krishnagiri District.
3. The Deputy Registrar of  
Co- operative Societies, Hosure circle, Hosur,  
Krishnagiri District 635 109.
4. K.K.136, Thorapalli Primary Agricultural Co-  
Op.  
Credit Society Ltd., Rep. by its Administrator,  
Thorapalli Post, Hosur Taluk, Krishnagiri  
District 635109.



WEB COPY

WP No. 4772 of 2



**V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.**

rap

**WP No. 4772 of 2026**

**12-02-2026**