IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

WP No. 9955 of 2016

P.Manimegalai
W/o.M.K.Raju, Special Tahsildar (Land Acquisition) District Backward Office, District Collectorate, Coimbatore District

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The Secretary to Government
Revenue (Service (Pani) 10(1) Department, Fort St. George, Chennai-9

2. The Special Commissioner and
Commissioner for Revenue Administration, Chepauk, Chennai-5

3. The Secretary
Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission, Fazar Bridge Road, Chennai-3

..Respondent(s)

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a writ of certiorari calling for the records of the first respondent in connection with the impugned order passed by the first respondent in his proceedings bearing G.O.(1D).No.154, Revenue [Services - (Pani) 10(1)] Department dated 03.03.2016 (served on the petitioner on 11.03.2016) and quash the same.

For Petitioner(s):	Ms.V.Kaanchana for Mr.V.Vijayshankar
For RR 1 and 2:	Mr.John S.Raja Singh, Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

The present writ petition has been filed against the impugned order dated 03.03.2016 demoting the petitioner as Deputy Tahsildar, Coimbatore District, who was serving as Special Tahsildar in Land Acquisition Department, on the charges of bribery.

2. The brief facts of the case are as follows:

2.1 While the writ petitioner was serving as Special Tahsildar, Distress Relief Scheme, at Coimbatore North Taluk Office, one Ravichandran was working as Assistant in the same office.

2.2 Based on the allegations of bribery, an enquiry was contemplated before the Tribunal in TDP No.17 of 2007, which was instituted on 13.10.2007, in which, the writ petitioner was charged as AO1 on 24.10.2007 and Ravichandran was charged as AO2 on 19.10.2007. The witnesses were examined and documents were marked.

2.3 The allegation against the writ petitioner is that on the instructions of the writ petitioner, Ravichandran had received Rs.500/- on demand from the beneficiaries, with regard to a social welfare scheme, in which, the beneficiaries are entitled to Rs.10,000/- and thereby, Ravichandran received Rs.500/- at the instance of the writ petitioner.

3. The learned counsel for the writ petitioner submitted that there are no specific allegations against the writ petitioner that she had directed Ravichandran to receive the amount of Rs.500/-, however, the Enquiry Officer has come to the conclusion on the basis of preponderance of probability and held that the allegations against the writ petitioner has been proved. However, the person, who had received the money from the beneficiaries *i.e.* Ravichandran was exonerated by the Tribunal.

4. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 has filed a counter affidavit and submitted that the allegations are proved and in fact, PW1, who was examined before the Tribunal, has stated as follows: "AO1 had obtained her signature in one receipt and gave one form and asked her to get signature of the Village Administrative Officer in it and bring it back and the Village Administrative Officer did not come along with her and only signed and gave it". The learned Additional Government Pleader pointed out that the statement given by PW1 is reasonable in nature and the culpability of the writ petitioner cannot be thrown out.

5. Heard both sides and perused the records.

6. In the absence of any specific material as against the petitioner, the findings on preponderance of probability cannot be taken into consideration and

it is a case of no evidence. In case of disciplinary proceedings one has to see whether there are some evidence as against the delinquent. As far as the writ petitioner is concerned, there is no evidence attributed against her. Therefore, the impugned order dated 03.03.2016 passed by the first respondent in his proceedings bearing G.O.(1D).No.154, Revenue [Services - (Pani) 10(1)] Department, is liable to be set aside.

Accordingly, this writ petition is allowed by setting aside the impugned order dated 03.03.2016 passed by the first respondent in his proceedings bearing G.O.(1D).No.154, Revenue [Services - (Pani) 10(1)] Department. Since the writ petitioner is superannuated, she is entitled for all notional benefits and hence, the respondents concerned shall disburse all the notional benefits to the writ petitioner within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs.

13-03-2026

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

nsd

To

1. The Secretary to Government
   Revenue (Service (Pani) 10(1) Department, Fort
   St. George, Chennai-9

2. The Special Commissioner and
   Commissioner for Revenue Administration,
   Chepauk, Chennai-5

3. The Secretary
   Tamilnadu Public Service Commission, Fazar
   Bridge Road, Chennai-3

N.SENTHILKUMAR J.

nsd

WP No. 9955 of 2016

13-03-2026