WEB COPY

Order QR

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Case QR

DATED: 03-11-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE KRISHNASWAMY GOVINDARAJAN

WP No. 24526 of 2014

CNR: {HCMA011139012014}

K.Sampath

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Commissioner of Rural
   Development and Panchayat Raj,
   Panagal Building, Saidapet,
   Chennai-600 015.

2. The District Collector,
   (PD Section), Thiruvannamalai District.

..Respondent(s)

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorari, praying to call for the records pertaining to the order bearing Na.Ka.No.73840/ 2012/TPC.1-2 dated 28.03.2013 of the 1st respondent confirming the order bearing Roc.No.928/2011/PA1-2 dated 26.07.2012 of the 2nd respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.V.Roshankumar
For M/s.T.Hemalatha

For Respondent(s): Mr.C.P.Goutham
Government Advocate

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed to quash the order of the first respondent bearing Na.Ka.No.73840/ 2012/TPC.1-2 dated 28.03.2013, confirming the order bearing Roc.No.928/2011/PA1-2 dated 26.07.2012 of the 2nd respondent.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

2. Heard the counsel appearing for the petitioner and the counsel appearing for the respondents.

3. When the matter is taken up today, it is represented by the counsel for the petitioner that the writ petitioner is no more.

4. The counsel for the respondents would submit that the punishment imposed on the writ petitioner was the punishment of reduction to the lower post as Deputy Block Development Officer for a period of 10 years, as a measure of penalty for the proven charges, with effect from 26.07.2012. Subsequently, during the pendency of the writ petition, the petitioner attained superannuation and has since passed away. The punishment imposed on the writ petitioner has technically been completed.

5. The counsel for the respondents further submitted that all pensionary benefits have been settled in favour of the legal heirs of the petitioner and nothing survives for consideration and prays for dismissal of the writ petition.

6. Considering the nature of the charges, this Court feels that the punishment is proportionate to the charges and that there is no question of any interference in the writ jurisdiction.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

7. In view of the same, the writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

03-11-2026

Index: Yes
Speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

kak

To

1. The Commissioner of Rural
   Development and Panchayat Raj,
   Panagal Building, Saidapet,
   Chennai-600 015.

2. The District Collector,
   (PD Section), Thiruvannamalai District.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

KRISHNASWAMY GOVINDARAJAN, J.

kak

WP No. 24526 of 2014

03-11-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis