



WEB COPY

WP No. 10620 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE P.T. ASHA

WP No. 10620 of 2026

&

WMP.No. 11511 of 2026

E.Paulraj

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State Of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Home Secretary to Government,
Police Department, Secretariat, Fort St.
George,
Chennai-009.
2. The Director General of Police
O/o. Director General of Police,
No.601, Dr.Radhakrishan Salai,
Mylapore,
Chennai-04.
3. The Additional Director General of Police
(Law and Order),
O/o. Director General of Police,
No.601, Dr.Radhakrishan Salai,
Mylapore,
Chennai-04.
4. The Deputy Inspector General of Police
O/o. Inspector General of Police,
Tirunelveli Range,
Tirunelveli.

..Respondent(s)



Prayer: This writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking writ of certiorarified to call for the records of the 4th respondent in his proceeding in C.No.C1/ 2273/ 2013 dated 09.07.2013 and proceedings of the 3rd respondent in R.Dis.No.26285/ AP2 (1)/ 2014 dated 18.05.2016 and proceedings of the 1st respondent in G.O. (D).No.292, Home (POL IV) Department dated 22.03.2018 and quash the same and Consequently direct the respondents to restore the 3 increments and settle the consequential benefits with 6 percent interest to the petitioner.

For Petitioner(s): D.Soundar Raj

For Respondent(s): Mr. T.Chandrasekaran
Standing Counsel

ORDER

This writ petition is filed for the following relief:

“To call for the records of the 4th respondent in his proceeding in C.No.C1/ 2273/ 2013 dated 09.07.2013 and proceedings of the 3rd respondent in R.Dis.No.26285/ AP2 (1)/ 2014 dated 18.05.2016 and proceedings of the 1st respondent in G.O.(D).No.292, Home (POL IV) Department dated 22.03.2018 and quash the same and Consequently direct the respondents to restore the 3 increments and settle



23.01.2010. It is submitted that 3 charges were framed against the petitioner vide proceedings dated 24.03.2010, for which the petitioner sent his reply on 07.04.2010.

5. Since the petitioner's request for cancellation of charges were not considered, he approached the Madurai Bench of this Court by filing W.P(MD).No.2811 of 2010 and this Court was pleased to pass orders on 16.07.2010 to consider his representation dated 30.01.2010. The report given by the Additional Superintendent of Police was accepted by the Superintendent of Police, Thoothukudi, as it is and the same was sent to the 4th respondent and 4th respondent imposed a punishment vide his proceedings dated 18.05.2011.

6. The petitioner preferred a Statutory Appeal vide letter dated 07.07.2011 to the 3rd respondent. He modified the order vide his proceedings dated 30.01.2013 and the 4th respondent modified the punishment vide his proceedings 09.07.2013. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner preferred a review petition before the 3rd respondent and the same was rejected by order dated 18.05.2016. Challenging the rejection order, the petitioner preferred an appeal before the 1st respondent and the



same was also rejected by the order dated 22.03.2018.

7. Challenging the same, the petitioner is before this Court.

8. Heard the learned counsels on the either side and perused the records.

9. A perusal of the records would show that the impugned order has been passed as early as on 22.03.2018. The disciplinary authority had imposed punishment of postponement of increment for 3 years which operate to postpone his future increments. This order was passed on 09.07.2013. Against the above order, the petitioner had preferred a review petition to the 3rd respondent. The 3rd respondent by order dated 18.05.2016 had confirmed the punishment.

10. The petitioner had moved the mercy petition to the Government against the said order and the 1st respondent by its order dated 22.03.2018 had also proceeded to confirm the order passed by the 4th respondent. The punishment which has been imposed as early as in the year 2013 has worked itself out.



11. That apart, the petitioner has filed this writ petition 8 years after his mercy petition had been rejected by the 1st respondent and no satisfactory reasons have been stated for the said delay. The reasons given about the mental agony and Covid -19 is totally baseless since as on the date of the order of the 1st respondent, the Covid - 19 had not even set in.

12. Therefore, I see no reason to interfere with the impugned order. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

18-03-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

KAN



To

WEB COPY

1. The State Of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Home Secretary to Government,
Police Department, Secretariat, Fort St. George,
Chennai-009.
2. The Director General of Police
O/o. Director General of Police,
No.601, Dr.Radhakrishnan Salai,
Mylapore,
Chennai-04.
3. The Additional Director General of Police
(Law and Order),
O/o. Director General of Police,
No.601, Dr.Radhakrishnan Salai,
Mylapore,
Chennai-04.
4. The Deputy Inspector General of Police
O/o. Inspector General of Police,
Tirunelveli Range,
Tirunelveli.



WEB COPY

WP No. 10620 of 2



P.T.ASHA, J.

KAN

WP No. 10620 of 2026

18-03-2026