



W.P.(MD)No.6216 of 2026

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 10.03.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR

W.P.(MD)No.6216 of 2026

Ganesan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Superintending Engineer,
O/o.the Superintending Engineer,
TANGEDCO/TNEB,
Madurai Electricity Distribution Circle,
K.Pudur,
Madurai District-625 007.

2.The Chief Engineer,
O/o.the Chief Engineer,
Madurai Region,
TANGEDCO/TNEB,
Madurai Electricity Distribution Circle,
K.Pudur,
Madurai District-625 107.



W.P.(MD)No.6216 of 2026

WEB COPY

3.The Executive Engineer,
O/o.the Executive Engineer,
TANGEDCO/TNEB,
Madurai Electricity Distribution Circle,
Samayanallur,
Madurai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondent No.2 to revoke the Suspension Order in Memo No. 1027/SE/MEDC/MDU/ADO/ADMI/A-3/F.Suspension/2025 dated 19.09.2025 passed by the first respondent and reinstate the petitioner in any non-sensitive post for the Post of Foreman first Grade in light of the guidelines issued under chapter-II, Section 2(3) of Tamil Nadu Electricity Board Employees Discipline and Appeal Regulations by considering the petitioner's representation dated 19.11.2025 within the time stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.I.Pinaygash
For R1 to R3 : Mr.B.Ramanathan
Standing Counsel



W.P.(MD)No.6216 of 2026

WEB COPY

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed seeking a writ of mandamus directing the respondent No.2 to revoke the suspension of the petitioner imposed vide memo No.1027/SE/MEDC/MDU/ADO/ADMI/A-3/F.Suspension/2025, dated 19.9.2025.

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondents.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner was placed under suspension as early as on 19.9.2025. In terms of the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board Employees Discipline and Appeal Regulations, more specifically Regulation 2(3), there is an obligation on the respondent Board to review the suspension periodically. Despite this mandatory provision contained in the aforementioned regulations, the respondent Board has not taken any steps so far.



W.P.(MD)No.6216 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. On the other hand, the learned Standing Counsel submits that this is a case involving vigilance and anti-corruption and therefore, it is obligatory for the respondent Board to refer the matter to the Director of Vigilance and Anti-Corruption before reviewing the suspension and deciding on the reinstatement of the petitioner. He further submits that in case the Director of Vigilance and Anti-corruption has no objection for reinstating the petitioner, the Board is ready to reinstate the petitioner into service.

5. Heard both sides and perused the entire materials on record.

6. Sub-regulation (3) of regulation 2 of the Board Regulations reads as follows:-

“3.All cases of suspension beyond the period of four months should be reviewed periodically either by the C.E, or Chairman or by the S.E, as case may be. In cases where, the suspension is not justified for valid reasons, the appropriate authority can revoke the suspension. In cases involving corruption, if the matter has been referred to Director of Vigilance and Anti Corruption, the



W.P.(MD)No.6216 of 2026

WEB COPY

suspension may be revoked after consulting the Director of Vigilance and Anti Corruption not only as a measure to avoid hardship to the Board employee concerned, but also to reduce additional expenditure to Board. The competent authorities should make a review of all such cases and examine whether the suspension could not be revoked pending the disciplinary proceedings, in the light of the criteria laid down in the amttter of suspension.”

7. From the perusal of the above, it is evident that there is an obligation on the respondent Board to review the suspension periodically. While the officials of the respondent Board are required to review the suspension, in this case, it has admittedly not been done.

8. Further, the learned counsel for the petitioner placed reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Civil Appeal No.10856 of 2016, in the case of Bhupinder Singh V. Unitech Ltd., & others, dated 23.01.2025.*** The relevant paragraph is extracted hereunder:-



W.P.(MD)No.6216 of 2026

WEB COPY

“12. There can hardly be any dispute that on expiry of six months period of suspension, ordinarily a Government official would become entitled to subsistence allowance at the rate of 75% of the pay, save and except when such subsistence allowance has to be denied for some valid reasons. We, thus, proceed on a premise that most of the suspended officers/officials are not receiving 75% pay without having to perform any work. Additionally, considering charge sheets have been issued very recently in October, 2024, we can safely infer that the conclusion of the departmental proceedings will take some reasonable time. Similarly, the criminal proceedings pending against the suspended officials, are also not likely to reach to a logical conclusion within a short time.”

9. In the light of the above and taking into consideration the submissions made by Mr.B.Ramanathan, learned Standing Counsel, the writ petition is disposed of with a directing to the first respondent to review suspension order dated 19.09.2025, placing the petitioner under suspension, in accordance with sub-regulation (3) of Regulation 2, and to pass appropriate orders thereon as expeditiously as possible, at any rate, within a period of six weeks from date of receipt of a copy of this order.



W.P.(MD)No.6216 of 2026

WEB COPY 10. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

10.03.2026

Neutral Citation: Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
am

MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR, J.

Page 7 of 8



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.6216 of 2026

am

W.P.(MD)No.6216 of 2026

10.03.2026