



W.P.(MD)No.9662 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 15.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P.(MD)No.9662 of 2026

Rajalingam

.. Petitioner

- Vs. -

1.The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation
Limited, CMDA Tower-II,
IV Floor, Gandhi Irwin Bridge Road,
Egmore, Chennai-600 008.

2.The Senior Regional Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation
Limited (TASMAC),
Plot No.100, Anna Nagar,
Madurai-20.

3.The District Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Limited
(TASMAC), TASCOT Unit, Mulipadi,
Dindigul District-624 005.

.. Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 3 to provide compensation of amount of Rs.25,00,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Lakhs only) to the petitioner based on the petitioner's representation dated 04.03.2026.



W.P.(MD)No.9662 of 2026

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Vellaichamy
For Respondents : Mr.H.Arumugam
Standing Counsel

ORDER

The Writ Petition is filed seeking for a direction to pay a compensation of Rs.25,00,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Lakhs only) based on the petitioner's representation dated 04.03.2026.

2. Upon hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the material records of the case, the petitioner was a supervisor in TASMACH Shop No.3161, Kodai Road. Nilakkottai Taluk, Dindigul District, in the year 2018. Whiles, a false FIR in Crime No.330 of 2018 came to be filed, in which the petitioner was also added as an accused later on. The petitioner and the other accused were charged for the alleged offences under Sections 302, 328 and 201 of IPC and Section 3(2)(v) of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act. Whiles, immediately upon the registration of the First Information Report without any enquiry whatsoever, straightaway an order of termination was passed against the petitioner on 05.12.2018. The petitioner had challenged the said order of



W.P.(MD)No.9662 of 2026

termination by way of W.P(MD)No.15034 of 2019 and by an order dated 14.07.2020, this Court found that the order of termination could not have been passed without conduct of a disciplinary enquiry, as the same is passed on an allegation against the petitioner. Thereafter, an order of suspension was initially passed against the petitioner and thereafter, he was reinstated into service. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that subsequently, the Sessions Case in S.S.C.No.19 of 2019 also ended in acquittal. The petitioner had to suffer all these years on account of the wrongful termination. The urgency with which the termination order passed smacks of vengeance against the petitioner. Even before the petitioner was formally arrayed as an accused in the First Information Report, the order of termination was straightaway passed. The petitioner had suffered on account of the same and therefore, for the wrongful act committed by the respondent, the petitioner is entitled for compensation. The learned counsel would rely upon the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Maharana Pratap Singh Vs. The State of Bihar and others***¹, whereunder compensation of a sum of Rs.30,00,000/- (Rupees Thrity Lakhs only) has been granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The learned counsel would also rely upon the Judgment in ***Smt. Nilabati Behera Alias Lalit Behera Vs. State of Orissa and others***², where also compensation was ordered. Therefore, the

¹ 2025 INSC 554

² 1993 (2) SCC 746



W.P.(MD)No.9662 of 2026

learned counsel would submit that the respondent should be directed to pay compensation.

3. Per contra, the learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents would submit that after the earlier order was set aside, the petitioner was placed under suspension. The charge memo dated 22.09.2020 was also issued against the petitioner and the same is kept pending because the criminal case was pending. Now that the criminal case is disposed of, the disciplinary enquiry will be taken to its logical course.

4. I have considered the rival submissions made on either side and perused the material records of the case.

5. First of all, the petitioner's termination was earlier set aside not on merits but on the grounds of principles of natural justice. It is not as if that the petitioner was not at all involved in any criminal case, and that action was initiated against him without any ground whatsoever. The petitioner was very much prosecuted and only now, by the Judgment in S.S.C.No.16 of 2019, the petitioner is acquitted, granting the benefit of doubt. Therefore, it is not as if some wrongful action has been taken against the petitioner. In any event, when



W.P.(MD)No.9662 of 2026

the petitioner earlier challenged the order, no consequential relief of any compensation was given. But on the other hand, the order was set aside only on the ground of violation of principles of natural justice. Subsequently, the petitioner is also reinstated into service and as on date, he is continuing his service. Therefore, this is the service matter pure on simple and no other rights of the petitioner are violated. If ultimately the disciplinary proceedings end up in favor of the petitioner, then the balance of wages, as the case may be, after deducting the subsistence allowance, shall be paid to the petitioner. No other compensation can be claimed by the petitioner. As far as the Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Maharana Pratap Singh*¹ is concerned, that is the case wherein, in lieu of reinstatement, back wages and other benefits, compensation is granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Similarly, in *Nilabati Behera*² cited *supra*, was a case of custodial death for which compensation was ordered.

6. Therefore, the prayer in the present writ petition to grant compensation to the petitioner cannot be countenanced and as such stands rejected. However, the respondent shall apply their mind with reference to the disciplinary proceedings and shall pass final orders with reference to the same. If ultimately the final orders are in favor of the petitioner, needless to mention that after



W.P.(MD)No.9662 of 2026

deducting the subsistence allowance already paid, the balance wages, if any, shall be disbursed as expeditiously as possible. Let the respondents apply their mind and finalize the disciplinary proceedings within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a web copy of the order. The Writ Petition is disposed of accordingly. No costs.

15.04.2026

NCC : Yes
sji

To

- 1.The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation
Limited, CMDA Tower-II,
IV Floor, Gandhi Irwin Bridge Road,
Egmore, Chennai-600 008.
- 2.The Senior Regional Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation
Limited (TASMAC),
Plot No.100, Anna Nagar,
Madurai-20.
- 3.The District Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Marketing Corporation Limited
(TASMAC), TASCO Unit, Mulipadi,
Dindigul District-624 005.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.9662 of 2026

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

sj1

W.P.(MD)No.9662 of 2026

15.04.2026