



WP(MD). No.14116 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Date : 13/05/2026

CORAM

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

**WP(MD). No.14116 of 2026
and WMP(MD) No.10527 of 2026**

B.Ramakrishnan

... Petitioner

Vs

1. The Deputy Inspector General of Police,,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District..

2. The Enquiry Officer / Additional Superintendent of Police,
Cyber Crime Section,
Sivagangai District..

3. Thiru.C.Udhayakumar / the Enquiry Officer,
Cyber Crime Section,
Sivagangai District..

... Respondents

PRAYER :-Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the 1st respondent to change the enquiry officer namely the 3rd respondent by considering the petitioners representation dated 10.03.2026.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Balaji
For Respondents : Mr.D.Gandhiraj
Special Government Pleader



ORDER

This writ petition has been filed for a mandamus to direct the 1st respondent to change the enquiry officer namely the 3rd respondent by considering the petitioner's representation dated 10.03.2026.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Special Government Pleader for the respondents. By consent of both sides, the writ petition itself is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself.

3. While the petitioner was serving as Inspector of Police, District Crime Branch, Sivagangai District, an FIR came to be registered against him in Crime No.7/2022 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Vigilance and Anti Corruption, Sivagangai. Pursuant to the registration of the FIR, the petitioner was arrested and remanded to judicial custody and subsequently he was placed under suspension. Even after the petitioner attained the age of superannuation, he was not allowed to retire from service. Pursuant to the criminal case, disciplinary proceedings were initiated against him and charge memo was issued on 04.07.2023. The



WP(MD). No.14116 of 2026

petitioner has submitted his explanation for the said charges. Not being satisfied with the said explanation, the disciplinary authority appointed an Enquiry Officer to proceed with the disciplinary proceedings. The enquiry officer conducted enquiry and examined three witnesses. Though the witnesses deposed in favour of the delinquent, the Enquiry Officer submitted a report stating that all the charges were proved. Therefore, the petitioner submitted a representation seeking change of Enquiry Officer. However, since the same has not been considered so far, the petitioner is before this Court.

4. The prayer that has been sought for cannot be considered for the simple reason that already an Enquiry Officer was appointed, who had conducted an enquiry by examining three witnesses. Therefore, at this stage, the reason that has been assigned by the petitioner for change of Enquiry Officer cannot be countenanced. If at all the witnesses failed to support the case of the department, no one can say the charges are proved. That apart, even assuming that the Enquiry Officer submitted a report by stating that all the charges are proved, the petitioner can very well agitate the same before the disciplinary authority by citing the



WP(MD). No.14116 of 2026

evidence of the witnesses.

WEB COPY

5. In view of the above, the writ petition is dismissed as devoid of merits. No costs. Consequently connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

13.05.2026

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

RR

TO

1. The Deputy Inspector General of Police,,
Ramanathapuram,
Ramanathapuram District..

2. The Enquiry Officer / Additional Superintendent of Police,
Cyber Crime Section,
Sivagangai District..



WEB COPY



WP(MD). No.14116 of 2026

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J

RR

**ORDER
IN
WP(MD) No.14116 of 2026**

Date : 13.05.2026