



W.P(MD) No.9178 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 08.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR

W.P(MD) No.9178 of 2026

and

W.M.P(MD)No.7371 of 2026

N.Iyyappan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Director of Municipal Administration,
75, Urban Administrative Building,
Santhome High Road, Mrc Nagar,
Raja Annamalaipuram,
Chennai - 600 028.

2.The Commissioner
Keelakarai Municipalai,
Ramanathapuram District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorari to call for records pertaining to the impugned order in Na.Ka.No.379/2024/C1 dated 27.03.2026 on the file of Respondent No.2 and quash the same as illegal.



W.P(MD) No.9178 of 2026

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Aswin Raja Simman
For Respondents : Mr.B.Ramanathan – for R1
Additional Government Pleader
Mr.K.Saravanan – for R2
Standing Counsel

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the proceedings bearing Na.Ka.No.379/2024/C1 dated 27.03.2026 issued by the 2nd respondent dismissing the petitioner from service.

2. The petitioner herein who was initially appointed as a Pump Operator and subsequently, appointed as an Office Assistant and while he was working as such the impugned order came to be issued. There appears to be some dispute about the educational qualification of the petitioner and in those connections, the petitioner was issued with notice during the year 2025 and thereafter, no further action was taken, however, while the petitioner was due to retire on attaining the age of superannuation on 31.03.2026, the impugned order dated 27.03.2026 came to be issued dismissing the petitioner from service on the ground



W.P(MD) No.9178 of 2026

that the petitioner entered into service without possessing required educational qualification.

3. When the matter came up for admission before this Court on 06.04.2026 this Court having taken note of the contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner contending that the impugned proceedings has been issued by violation of principles of natural justice i.e., without issuing any notice, this Court afforded an opportunity to the learned Standing Counsel appearing for 2nd respondent to get instructions in this regard.

4. Today, the matter is taken up for further consideration, Mr.K.Saravanan, learned Standing Counsel appearing for the 2nd respondent fairly submitted that notice was issued during the year 2025, requiring the petitioner to produce the relevant educational qualification possessed by him and the petitioner submitted that he does not having any such educational certificate.



W.P(MD) No.9178 of 2026

WEB COPY

5. He also further submitted that thereafter, an enquiry was conducted by the District Inspection Committee and came to the conclusion that the educational certificate that was produced by the petitioner, at the time of his initial appointment was a fake certificate. However, confirmed the fact that no charge has been framed against the petitioner nor any detailed enquiry was conducted by putting the petitioner on notice and no show cause notice was also issued before issuing the impugned proceedings.

6. In the light of the above, this Court is of the considered view that the enquiry that was conducted by the 2nd respondent behind the back of the petitioner in the year 2025 cannot be elevated to the status of a disciplinary enquiry as contemplated under relevant rules applicable to the employees of the respondents Corporation. Admittedly, the disciplinary proceedings against the employees of the second respondent corporation are governed by rules and none of the procedure that is contemplated in the said rules have been followed by the respondents before issuing the impugned proceedings. Even no show cause notice



W.P(MD) No.9178 of 2026

was issued to the petitioner to show cause as to why he should not be dismissed from service. Further, the impugned proceeding came to be issued just 3 days before the date of superannuation of the petitioner without following due process.

7. Though the learned Standing counsel appearing for the respondent corporation sought time for filing counter, this Court does not see any reason to grant time for filing counter, in the light of the admitted fact situation, that no procedure has been followed and the impugned proceeding came to be issued in violation of the principles of natural justice.

8. In the light of the above, this Court is thoroughly convinced that the impugned proceedings cannot be allowed to stand.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed. The impugned proceeding dated 27.03.2026 is hereby quashed, leaving it open to the respondent Corporation to take appropriate action against the petitioner



W.P(MD) No.9178 of 2026

WEB COPY

in accordance with law. No costs. Consequently, connected
miscellaneous petition is closed.

08.04.2026

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
rm



W.P(MD) No.9178 of 2026

To
WEB COPY

- 1.The Managing Director
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation (Kum) Ltd.,
TNSTC Head Office,
No.27, Railway Station New Road,
Kumbakonam.
- 2.The General Manager,
Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation (Kum) Ltd.,
Kumbakonam Region,
No.27, Railway Station New Road,
Kumbakonam.



WEB COPY



W.P(MD) No.9178 of 2026

MUMMINENI SUDHEER KUMAR, J.

RM

W.P(MD) No.9178 of 2026

08.04.2026