



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated: 08.03.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **B. PUGALENDHI**

**WP (MD) Nos .28482 ,26207 ,26206 ,26208 ,26209 ,
25507 ,25508 ,25509 ,25510 ,25511 ,25512 ,
25647 ,25847 ,25848 ,25849 , 25850 ,28576 ,
29190 of 2022 ,3985 ,3986 ,3987 ,3988 ,3989 ,
3990 and 3991 of 2023 and
WMP (MD) Nos .20390 ,22488 ,19981 ,20378 ,20381 ,
22579 ,19589 ,19590 ,19591 ,19592 ,19594 ,
19595 ,19736 ,19979 ,19983 ,19985 ,19986 ,
20382 ,20383 ,22581 ,23127 of 2022 ,3861 ,
3862 ,3864 ,3865 ,3866 ,3867 and 3869 of 2023**

WP (MD) No.28482 of 2022

V.Subramani

... Petitioner

Vs

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Municipal Administration and
Water Supply (MA4) Department,
Govt of Tamil Nadu, Secretariat,
St.George Fort, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of
Municipal Administration,
No.3, MRC Nagar,
Raja Annamalaipuram,
Chennai - 600 028.
- 3.The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Collectorate, Madurai.
- 4.The Commissioner,
Thirumangalam Municipality,
Thirumangalam Town, Madurai District.



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

5.The Chairman,
Thirumangalam Municipality,
Thirumangalam Town, Madurai District.

6.The Superintendent of Police,
Madurai.

7.The Inspector of Police (Traffic),
Thirumangalam Police Station.

[R6 and R7 are suo motu
impleaded vide court order
dated 17.08.2023]

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ of certiorarified mandamus to call for the records pertaining to the impugned notice issued by the 4th respondent dated 12.12.2022 vide Na.Ka.No.62/2021/A2 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents 1 to 3 to proceed with the G.O(MS)NO.66 dated 27.05.2019 and GO(Ms)No.20 dated 25.01.2022 of Municipal Administration and Water Supply (MA4) Department.

For Petitioners : Mr.Ajmal Khan,

Senior Counsel for
Mr.Babu Rajendran

For Respondent : Mr.Veerakathiravan,
Nos.4 and 5 Addl Advocate General
assisted by Mr.A.Kannan,
Standing Counsel

For Respondent : Mr.M.Sarangan,
Nos.1 to 3 Addl.Govt.Pleader

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottaichamay,
Nos.6 and 7 Govt.Advocate (CrlSide)



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

WEB COPY

ORDER

This batch of writ petitions is filed as against the impugned notice dated 12.12.2022 issued by the Commissioner, Tirumangalam to evict these petitioners and also for a consequential relief for a direction to the respondents 1 to 3 to proceed with GO.Ms.No.66 dated 27.05.2019 dated 27.05.2019 and GO.Ms.No.20 dated 25.01.2022 Municipal Administration and Water Supply (MA4) Department.

2.The petitioners lessees under the 4th respondent Municipality are in possession of the shops in Tirumangalam bus stand, maintained by the Tirumangalam Municipality. The lease period of these petitioners were renewed with effect from 2017 upto 31.03.2026. By the order impugned in these writ petitions, the 4th respondent Municipality has directed all these petitioners to evict from the shops that the municipality is intending to demolish the existing bus stand and to construct a new bus



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

stand.

WEB COPY

3.The petitioners have filed these writ petitions in the strength of government orders in G.O.Ms.No.66 Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 27.05.2019 and the government order in G.O.Ms.No.20 dated 25.01.2022 that the government has already taken a policy decision for constructing a new bus stand for Tirumangalam municipality at Venkatasamuthiram on the national highways. While so the 4th respondent has directed the petitioners to evict the shops on the ground of renovation, when the lease is in force and upto the year 2026.

4.The learned Counsel for the petitioners attributed *malafide* on the 4th respondent and demonstrated that the existing bus stand was constructed only in the year 1982, the stability of the building is good, there is no necessity to demolish the existing building and to construct a new bus stand in the same place. The 4th respondent municipality in the year 2018 had passed a resolution



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

that the existing bus stand was not suitable in the present scenario that this bus stand was causing huge traffic and cause for several accidents, requested the government to allot space in the national highways at Venkatasamuthiram to an extent of 2.54.13 hectares in the national highways for construction of new bus stand. While so the reasons given by the 4th respondent to evict these petitioners is unreasonable and with malafides.

5.The learned Additional Advocate General submits that the existing bus stand at Tirumangalam was constructed 37 years ago in 1.33 acres with 34 shops and parking facility of 29 buses. It is now structurally dangerous for the safety and security of the passengers. Therefore the 4th respondent municipality has decided to demolish the existing structures and to construct a new bus stand. He admits that a decision was taken to construct a new bus stand for Tirumangalam municipality at Venkatasamuthiram, which was later on found to be not feasible that the said place is not having uniform



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

width and breath around it and also situated below 17 feet down from the national highways road. Therefore it is now decided to demolish the existing bus stand and to construct a new building. The learned Additional Advocate General has also referred to the following judgments in support of his arguments and submits that neither the petitioners nor this Court can interfere with the policy decision of the Government and these petitioners as lessees are not having any right to dictate the 4th respondent with regard to the proposal of constructing new bus stand.

6.The learned Additional Advocate General further submits that the court cannot sit in judgment over the wisdom of the policy evolved by the legislature and the subordinate regulation-making body. The wisdom and advisability of the policies are ordinarily not amenable to judicial review unless the policies are contrary to statutory or constitutional provisions or arbitrary or irrational or an abuse of power. The Court cannot strike down a circular / government order or a policy merely because there is



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

a variation or contradiction. What is important is to know whether *malafides* vitiates or irrational and extraneous factors fouls. In the matter of policy, when the government takes a decision bearing in mind several aspects, the court should not interfere with the same. The Courts in the exercise of their jurisdiction will not transgress into the field of policy decision.

7.The learned Additional Advocate General further submits that the legislature and its delegate are the sole repositories of the power to decide what policy should be pursued in relation to matters covered by the Act and there is no scope for any interference by the Courts unless the particular provision impugned before it can be said to suffer from any legal infirmity in the sense of its being wholly beyond the scope of the regulation-making power of it being inconsistent with any of the provisions of the parent enactment or in violation of any of the limitations imposed by the constitution. Any drawbacks in the policy incorporated in a rule or



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

regulation will not render it ultra vires and the Court cannot strike it down on the ground that in its opinion, it is not a wise or prudent policy, as long as both trial and error are bona fide and within the limits of authority. The learned Additional Advocate General has relied on the following decisions in support of his argument:

1.The Commissioner, Nagercoil Municipality, Nagercoil Vs D.Chellam and another, reported in **2018 (2) CWC 470:**

2.Tamil Nadu Education Department, Ministerial and General Subordinate Service Association Vs State of Tamil Nadu and others, reported in AIR 1980 SC 379;

3.Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and High Secondary Education and Others Vs Paritosh Bhupesh Kumarsheth reported in AIR 1984 SC 1543;

4.Premium Granites Vs State of Tamil Nadu, reported in 1994 (2) SCC 691;

5.Union of India Vs Dinesh Engineering Corporation reported in 2001 (8) SCC 491



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

WEB COPY 8.This Court considered the rival submissions and perused the materials placed on record.

9.The petitioners are lessees, who are running shops in Tirumangalam municipality bus stand for several years and their lease has been extended in the year 2017 upto the year 2026. While so, the petitioners were directed to evict the premises immediately that the 4th respondent municipality is intending to demolish the existing bus stand and to construct a new bus stand that the existing bus stand is not structurally sound. The petitioners have filed these writ petitions in the strength of the government orders in G.O.Ms.No.66 and G.O.Ms.No.20 Municipal and Water Supply Department dated 27.05.2019 and 25.01.2022 that the government has already taken a decision to construct the new bus stand for Tirumangalam municipality at Venkatasamuthiram on the national highways. While so the reasoning of the 4th respondent municipality for evicting these petitioners is not proper.



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

The existing bus stand at Tirumangalam was constructed 37 years ago in a small space to an extent of 1.33 acres with 34 shops with parking facilities, which can accommodate 29 buses. The 4th respondent municipality has passed a resolution in the year 2018 that the existing bus stand is causing more inconvenience to the passengers, leads to heavy traffic congestion and this has also become an accident prone area and made a request to the Commissioner of Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department to grant permission for constructing a new bus stand for Tirumangalam municipality. This resolution of the 4th respondent municipality was forwarded by the Commissioner, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department by his letter dated 28.1.2018. The government after careful consideration of the proposals made has accorded administrative sanction for a sum of Rs.21,72,00,000/- for construction of new bus stand for the 4th respondent municipality under Public-Private Partnership (PPP Mode) vide G.O.Ms.No.66 Municipal Administration and Water



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

Supply Department, dated 27.05.2019. The District Administration has provided lands in TS.Nos.7/4, 19, 20/2, 20/3, 21/2 and 22/3 at Venakatasamuthiram in Ward B to an extent of 2.54.13 hectares for the purpose of establishing a new bus stand. In fact the proposal was made after obtaining this enter upon permission from the District Collector. The 4th respondent municipality has also invited tenders on PPP mode on 29.01.2020 and on 20.06.2020. While so, the government vide G.O.Ms.No.20, dated 20.05.2022 has accorded administrative sanction for construction of new bus stand in Erode, Karur, Cuddalore, Tiruthani, Tirumangalam and to few other towns by allocating funds through infrastructure and amenities fund. Rs.25.34 crore was allotted for construction of Tirumangalam bus stand. The government earlier vide GO.Ms.No.66 has granted an administrative sanction for construction of new bus stand at Venkatasamuthiram in PPP mode at a cost of Rs.21.72 crore. However the private persons have not come forward to construct the bus stand along with



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

the government. Therefore, the government vide this subsequent order in G.O.Ms.No.20 has allotted Rs. 25.34 crore from the infrastructure and amenities fund to complete this project in the year 2022. GO.Ms.No.20 was passed on 25.01.2022 and on 17.02.2022 a request was made by the Commissioner, Tirumangalam municipality to the Government Engineering College, Tirunelveli to provide the feasibility report for the construction of new bus stand at Venkatasamuthiram. The Tirunelveli Engineering College has submitted a feasibility report on 09.03.2022 that the proposed land is lying on the outskirts of the town, ie., 2.5kms away from the existing bus stand and it has poor connectivity with the existing bus stand. Therefore the professor has suggested to develop the exiting bus stand with increasing the number of commercial shops so that the municipality may have more revenue from the proposed bus stand. Based on this report of the Government College of Engineering Tirunelveli, a resolution was passed by Tirumangalam municipality on 27.06.2022 that the place at Venkatasamuthiram is not suitable



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

for constructing new bus stand and decided to reconstruct the existing bus stand. The Commissioner, Tirumangalam municipality has also further requested the Government College of Engineering, Tirunelveli to give structural stability to the existing bus stand and the college has given a report on 21.07.2022 as under:

"The compressive strength of concrete for the existing bus stand building slab, beam and coloumn is less than the minimum compressive strength of concrete as per IS code.

The chances of unexpected failure is more than 60% due to the age of the building and poor strength of slab concrete. It is better to construct new building rather than the renovation of existing bus stand at Thirumangalam Municipality"

10.The learned Counsel for the petitioners has attributed *malafide* to the 4th respondent municipality and submits that this report of the Government College of Engineering, Tirunelveli was obtained



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

fraudulently in order to exploit the government funds by demolishing the existing building, which is in good condition. The petitioners claim that this building is in good condition that they are prepared to pay the required fee to ascertain the same. In view of the specific stand taken by the petitioners that when the condition of the existing building is good, a report has been obtained that the structural stability of this building is not good, this Court requested the National Institute of Technology, Tiruchirappalli to conduct a test on the structural stability of the existing bus stand at Tirumangalam and to file a report. The Professors of the National Institute of Technology, Tiruchirappalli have conducted a detailed study and also by conducting a rebound hammer test and submitted a report as under:

"Rebound Hammer Test

Rebound Hammer Test - IS 13311-2 (1992) was used to assess concrete's compressive strength, uniformity and quality.



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

WEB COPY

As per IS 13311-2(1992) the estimation of strength of concrete by rebound hammer method cannot be held to be very accurate and probable accuracy of prediction of concrete strength in a structure is $\pm 25\%$.

The rebound hammer equipment used on the site is AI-388. With respect to the instructions in the equipment, there can be deviations in the compressive strength, as mentioned in the table below:

Table.1. Strength Deviations

Com pressive Strength Range	Possibl e Deviation in Compressive Strength
$<10 \text{ N/mm}^2$	$\pm 4.5 \text{ N/mm}^2$
$10-20 \text{ N/mm}^2$	$\pm 6.0 \text{ N/mm}^2$
$20-30 \text{ N/mm}^2$	$\pm 6.5 \text{ N/mm}^2$
$30-40 \text{ N/mm}^2$	$\pm 7.0 \text{ N/mm}^2$
$40-50 \text{ N/mm}^2$	$\pm 7.5 \text{ N/mm}^2$
$50-70 \text{ N/mm}^2$	$\pm 8.0 \text{ N/mm}^2$

Based on the visual inspection by



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

the expert team, Rebound Hammer Tests were carried out on the critical positions / elements in the buildings.

General Remarks:

Visual observations and Rebound Hammer Test were made on-site

Based on the NDT test results, it was observed that the compressive strength of concrete in the external columns of North Block was less than 15 Mps (Minimum required design strength of concrete as per IS456:1978 - during the construction period. However, the compressive strength of concrete in most of the internal columns, beams and slabs was found to be more than 15 Mpa.

Six numbers of 12 mm rebars were used in the columns of north block and 4 numbers of 16 mm rebars were used in the columns of south and west blocks. Minor longitudinal cracks in the column due to the corrosion of the rebars were observed. However, the diameter of the rebar and was not severely affected due to the corrosion.

No severe cracks were found on the structural elements (Beams, Columns and



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

Slabs)

Spalling of concrete from the structural members was not observed.

In the roof, a few pointings on the pressed tiles were degraded, which may lead to water ingress.

5. Suggestion:

1.The compressive strength of the concrete in most of the structural members determined with rebound hammer equipment was almost 15 Mpa which is the minimum design strength required as per IS 456:1978 - during the construction period. However, as per the recent code IS 456:2000, the required minimum design compressive strength of concrete is 20 MPa. However the building can withstand the existing loads with the following conditions:

Retrofitting on exterior columns in North Block

No further increase in load on the structural members

Proper maintenance is required like proper DPC in the roof and drainage



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

facility for the rainwater

2.On the day of inspection, the date pertaining to vehicular movement, number of vehicles, delay time, parking time, passenger amenities and additional details were not collected or made available to NIT, Trichy. Once these data are available, co-opting experts available in transportation engineering will be made use of and accommodating capacity can be determined.

Notes:

As no settlement cracks were observed in the structure, the foundation was not assessed in detail.

The structure can withstand the existing gravity loads. As per NBC (2016), periodic structural audit and engineered maintenance are required at least once every three years. This report does not account for any natural disasters and sudden environmental changes.

It is requested that Thirumangalam Municipality do the patching works on the testing location at the earliest."

11.This report of the National Institute of



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

Technology, Tiruchirappalli is contrary to the report of the Government College of Engineering, Tirunelveli. As per the report of the National Institute of Technology, the structural stability of the existing building is sound. The decision for constructing the new bus stand was taken by the 4th respondent municipality in the year 2018 based on the traffic congestion and the frequent accidents that took place in and around the bus stand. This condition prevalent in the year 2018, would definitely be worse in the year 2022. However, the 4th respondent municipality has now taken a decision to construct new bus stand by demolishing the existing structure in the very same place, which was considered to be more congestive and accident prone.

12.In order to ascertain the ground reality, the Superintendent of Police, Madurai District was impeladed as a party to this writ petition and was also requested to file a report on the ground reality. The Superintendent of Police, Madurai has filed his status report and the same is extracted as



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

under:

WEB COPY

"The number of accidents that took place in the last 5 years in and around Thirumangalam bus stand are ie from Usilampatti Road Junction to Rajaji Statue covering the distance of 1 Km inside the Thirumangalam Town area was studied and detailed account of the number of accidents that were taken place is given below:

Year	Number of accidents	Number of persons died	Number of accidents	Number of persons injured	Total Number of accidents
2018	1	1	21	32	22
2019	1	1	14	18	15
2020	1	1	12	15	13
2021	2	2	19	25	21
2022	4	4	13	17	17
2023	5	5	17	26	22
Total	14	14	96	133	110

It is respectfully submitted that Thirumangalam Town area especially in and around Thirumangalam bus stand faces a huge traffic congestion because of the following reasons:



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

The present Thirumangalam bus stand is located in very small space, which is inadequate to accommodate the increasing the density and flow of buses into the bus stand.

At present, the bus stand area can be accommodated only around 20 to 25 buses at a time. As a result, during peak hour of traffic, many buses including private buses stops haphazardly in front of the Thirumangalam bus stand on the Thirumangalam main road and deboarding of passengers hindering free flow of traffic.

The situation becomes very grave and unmanagable, especially during morning and evening hours, when there is huge traffic congestion because of movement of school/ college buses, private buses and office goers.

This is a common bus stand for both city / town busses and mofussil buses forcing the mofussil buses to stop the buses on the Thirumangalam main road itself for boarding and deboarding of passengers, as there is no sufficient



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

space inside the existing bus stand.

WEB COPY

With increasing fleet of buses and general vehicular density, traffic congestion in Thirumangalam Town area is becoming more and more difficult to manage since Thirumangalam main road area is a narrow road, which makes it difficult to create any separate lane for movement of buses or for stopping of buses."

13.Perusal of the report of the Superintendent of Police, shocks the conscience of this Court that the existing bus stand at Tirumangalam is very congested and also an accident prone area. 110 accidents have occurred in the past 5 years, which claimed 14 lives, besides injuring 133 persons.

14.This existing bus stand is in 1.3 acres, which can accommodate 20-25 buses at a time. The situation as per the report of the police is grave and un-managable, causing nuisance and menace to the residents of Tirumangalam Municipality.



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

15.The learned Additional Advocate General having gone through all these reports has vehemently argued the case on behalf of the 4th respondent that it is a policy decision and this Court is not supposed to interfere with the same. It is not known how these policy decisions are taken. If this present position in the year 2023 is so, the position in the year 2033 or 2044 is unimaginable. The very same 4th respondent has taken the so-called policy decision in the year 2018 that this existing bus stand is not conducive, congested and also accident prone. Based on that a resolution was passed in the year 2018, which was accepted by the government after due deliberations and verification in the year 2019 vide Go.Ms.No.66. When the government has already taken a decision to proceed with the construction of new bus stand at Venkatasamuthiram, it is not known, who authorised this Commissioner to question the credibility of the government, by getting a report from the Government College of Engineering, Tirunelveli that too on the feasibility of the construction of bus stand at Venkatasamuthiram.



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

The professor of Government College of Engineering, Tirunelveli has also given a report that this proposed place at Venkatasamuthiram is 2.5 Kms away from the existing bus stand in the national highways, there is no commercial building and basic amenities near the proposed site and therefore, it is not feasible. It is not known the competence of this department of civil engineering to give such a report and this policy decision appears to have been taken by the professors of the Government College of Engineering, Tirunelveli, who gave such a report. It is very sad to refer that the the recommendation has been made for developing the existing bus stand that it would augment the revenue, without considering traffic congestion and the accidents occurred in an around the bus stand. The very same Government College of Engineering, Tirunelveli has also given a structural stability certificate that the existing structure is not stable. However, the National Institute of Technology, Tiruchirappalli, which is having better reputation, has given a report that the structural stability of the existing



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

building is good. The report of the Government College of Engineering, Tirunelveli appears to be a tailor-made to fulfil the wishes of the 4th respondent and the 4th respondent has taken this policy decision for reasons best known to him.

16.The 4th respondent has not realised that he is utilising the public money to an extent of 25 crores for demolition of the existing bus stand and for construction of new bus stand in the very same place, without having any concern for the general public of Tirumangalam municipality.

17.The fact remains that Tirumangalam is situated en-route Madurai to Kanyakumari, Tirunelveli, Tenkasi, Srivilliputhur, Kovilpatti. The buses ply from Madurai to all the above place vice versa, would not enter into Tirumangalam town, due to traffic congestion. Therefore the passengers, those who visit the above places, have to board the buses only in the national highways and those who come to Tirumangalam have to alight in the national



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

highways itself. Therefore without fulfilling the needs of the residents of Tirumangalam and the commuters, passengers of Tirumangalam, the renovation of the existing building would not help in fulfilling the requirement of the municipality.

18.The constitutional powers conferred on the Government cannot be exercised in a careless and arbitrary manner against the public good. Every action taken by the Government must be in public interest and every activity of the Government must have the public element in it and it must be with reasoning and guided by public interest. The so-called policy decision can be interfered with, if the same is un-reasonable and against the public interest. The policy decision if any with manifestly arbitrary, capricious or *malafide*, this Court can interfere with that *malafide* decision.

19.The report of the Superintendent of Police, Madurai exposes the ground reality. The resolution of the 4th respondent municipality passed in the year



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

2018 also confirms the same. However the policy decision has been taken to demolish the existing building, which is constructed just 37 years ago and which is in good condition too. This decision has been taken only in order to utilise the fund allotted for re-construction of the bus stand in the very same place. This policy decision has been taken based on the report of the Government Engineering College, Tirunelveli. However the report of the National Institute of Technology, Tiruchirappalli contradicts the report of the Government Engineering College, Tiruchirappalli. The National Institute of Technology, Tiruchirappalli has a better reputation than the Government Engineering College, Tirunelveli. Therefore the veracity of the report of the Government Engineering College, Tirunelveli is doubtful.

20.In view of the foregoing discussion, these writ petitions are disposed of and the impugned notice is set aside, with a direction to the 1st respondent / the Secretary to the Government,



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department,

to look into the issue of constructing a new bus stand for Tirumangalam Municipality by considering the present condition, the future requirements and developments and shall take a decision within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. No costs. Consequently connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

08.03.2024

Internet : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Municipal Administration and
Water Supply (MA4) Department,
Govt of Tamil Nadu, Secretariat,
St.George Fort, Chennai - 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner of
Municipal Administration,
No.3, MRC Nagar,
Raja Annamalaipuram,
Chennai - 600 028.
- 3.The District Collector,
Madurai District,
Collectorate, Madurai.
- 4.The Commissioner,
Thirumangalam Municipality,
Thirumangalam Town,
Madurai District.
- 5.The Chairman,
Thirumangalam Municipality,
Thirumangalam Town,
Madurai District.
- 6.The Superintendent of Police,
Madurai.
- 7.The Inspector of Police (Traffic),
Thirumangalam Police Station.



WEB COPY



WP(MD)No.28482 of 2022.etc.,

B. PUGALENDHI , J .

dsk

**WP (MD) Nos . 28482 , 26207 , 26206 ,
26208 , 26209 , 25507 , 25508 ,
25509 , 25510 , 25511 , 25512 ,
25647 , 25847 , 25848 , 25849 ,
25850 , 28576 , 29190 of 2022 ,
3985 , 3986 , 3987 , 3988 , 3989 ,
3990 and 3991 of 2023**

08.03.2024