

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09.09.2015

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE K.RAVICHANDRABAABU

**O.A. Nos. 833, 834, 840, 841, 912, 913, 861, 862, 838, 839, 863, 864,
853, 854, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 873, 874, 910, 911, 871, 872,
879, 880, 877, 878, 875, 876, 836 & 837 of 2015
and**

Application No.5799 of 2015 in O.A.No.912 of 2015

M/s. Soundararaja Mills Limited	...Applicant in O.A.Nos.833 & 834/2015
M/s. Kiran Silicates Pvt. Ltd.	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 836 & 837/2015
M/s. Kiran Global Chems	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 838 & 839/2015
M/s. Vanjore Silicates	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 840 & 841/2015
M/s. Vaigai Industries (India)	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 861 & 862/2015
M/s. Reena Silicate Industries	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 853 & 854/2015
M/s. Karaikal Chlorates	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 863 & 864/2015
M/s. Chemplast Sanmar Ltd.	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 865 & 866/2015
M/s. Chemplast Sanmar Ltd.	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 867 & 868/2015
M/s. Diamond Silicate	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 869 & 870/2015
M/s. Sunrise Silicates P Ltd.	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 871 & 872/2015
M/s. Nannilam Silicate P. Ltd.	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 873 & 874/2015
M/s. Ezhil Chemicals P Ltd.	...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 875 & 876/2015

M/s. Jyothy Laboratories ...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 877 & 878/2015

M/s. Kamakshi Chemicals ...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 879 & 880/2015

M/s. Sree Raghavendra Alkalies ...Applicant in O.A.Nos. 910 & 911/2015

M/s. Regma Ceramics Limited ...Applicant in O.A.Nos.912 & 913/2015

M/s. Regma Ceramics Limited ...Applicant in A.No.5799/2015

Vs.

GAIL (India) Limited,
Rep. by Zonal Deputy General Manager,
7 A, KENCES Tower,
1, Ramakrishna St., North Usman Road,
T.Nagar, Chennai - 600017. ...Respondent in all the Applications

Application Nos. 833, 836, 838, 840, 853, 861, 864, 866, 868, 870, 871, 873, 876, 877, 880, 910 and 912 are filed under Order XIV Rule 8 read with Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, and to pass an order of temporary injunction restraining the respondent from disconnecting the gas supply as per the agreements dated 06.12.2010, 27.12.2010, 27.12.2010, 13.12.2010, 29.12.2010, 27.12.2010, 28.12.2010, 23.12.2010, 23.12.2010, 30.04.2014, 27.12.2010, 27.12.2010, 27.12.2010, 29.12.2010, 27.12.2010, 29.12.2010 and 30.12.2010 for Gas sales and transmission for the purchase of Natural Gas to the applicant with Customer Code Nos. 10482, 10261, 10372, 10560, 10405, 10559, 10257, 10861, 10109, 10127, 10515, 10323, 10137, 10206, 10253, 10494 and 10409 respectively.

Application Nos. 834, 837, 839, 841, 854, 862, 863, 865, 867, 869, 872, 874, 875, 878, 879, 911 and 913 of 2015 are filed under Order XIV Rule 8 read with Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, and to pass an order of temporary injunction restraining the respondent from invoking the letter of credit bearing No. 1275814LC0000001, 0702415LC0000043, 0702415LC0000044, 147/LC/60315/2015-16, 706/ILC/1/15, NIL, 0651/OLC/1/01/2010, 1046/OLCI/63/06, 1046/OLC/12/04,

ALC/1048314, 0702415LC0000042, 070415LC0000039, 0620LC00000004, BYB/INLC/17690/2012, 147ILC150314, 2008ILC16 and 053415ILCORD205, dated 24.09.2014, 14.01.2015, 14.01.2015, 27.05.2015, 24.03.2015, 08.10.2014, 29.11.2014, 17.03.2015, 17.03.2015, 30.08.2014, 14.01.2015, 14.01.2015, 14.01.2015, 04.02.2015, 09.12.2014, 11.12.2014 and 02.02.2015 for Gas Sales and transmission for the purchase of Natural Gas to the applicant with Customer Code No. 10482, 10261, 10372, 10560, 10405, 10559, 10257, 10861, 10109, 10127, 10515, 10323, 10137, 10206, 10253, 10494 and 10409 respectively.

Application No.5799/2015 is filed under Order XIV Rule 8 read with Section 9(ii)(a)(d) of Arbitration and Conciliation Act to pass an order of direction, directing the respondent to continue with the gas supply as per provision 15.10 the agreement dated 30.12.2010 for Gas sales and transmission for the purchase of Natural gas to the applicant with Customer Code 10409.

For Applicant in all applications: Mr. A.R.L.Sunderasan,
Senior Counsel
for Mr. P.Raja.

For Respondent in all applications: Mr. P.V.S.Giridhar,
for M/s. Giridhar & Sai

COMMON ORDER

All these applications are filed by various individual companies. As the issue involved in all these matters is one and the same with common facts and circumstances, I propose to dispose of these applications with a common order.

2. Each applicant company has filed two applications, one seeking for temporary injunction restraining the respondent, who is one and the same

person in all these matters, from disconnecting the gas supply as per the respective agreement with gas sales and transmission for the purchase of natural gas to the respective applicants. The other application is filed seeking for a temporary injunction restraining the respondent from invoking the respective letter of credit for gas sales and transmission for the purchase of natural gas to the respective applicant. Except the date of agreement, the customer code and date of letter of credit, all other facts and circumstances are one and the same in respect of every company/applicant. Therefore, the O.A. No. 834 of 2014 referred to by the learned counsels themselves, is taken as a sample case for considering and deciding all these applications.

3. The case of the applicant/company is as follows:-

The applicant company incorporated under the Companies Act entered into an agreement dated 06.12.2010 for gas sales on transmission fall back basis and upon other terms and conditions as stipulated in the said agreement. The said agreement is for the period ending on 31.12.2015, subject to availability of gas on fall back basis, meaning the respondent would supply to all the firms, quantity agreement holder first and thereupon, on the availability of excess gas, would supply to the fall back agreement holders. As per clause 5.2 of the said agreement, the applicant is

saddled with the obligation to take or pay quantity. When the excess gas is supplied to the consumers like that of the applicant, they are required to pay the respondent even for the quantity of gas not consumed. Though the applicant has raised the issue even before signing the contract, however was forced to sign the agreement as they were put to a disadvantageous situation without negotiating power. Therefore, the said agreement was signed by the applicant under protest. The respondent was not charging under the head minimum guarantee obligation (MGO) or take or pay quantity obligation from the date of agreement. This made the applicant believe that the respondent has dropped such charges as against the applicant. However, the applicant was issued with a bill dated 07.08.2015 for a sum of Rs. 72,26,943/- to be paid within three days failing which a threat to discontinue the supply of gas without any further notice and without the prejudice to their rights under the contract. The said notice is with respect to minimum guarantee obligation for the financial year 2014-15. The respondent claims that the same is with reference to their paying minimum guarantee obligation charges to the Oil and Natural Gas Commission (ONGC) on pro rata basis as per clause 5.2(b) of the agreement. The aforesaid invoices are raised for the gas which was not supplied to the applicant. Therefore, the very action of the respondent is illegal. Thus, the applicant applied for fixing an arbitrator under the Arbitration and

Conciliation Act, 1996. The respondent cannot disconnect the supply of gas unilaterally for non receipt of amount due to them, as per clause 15.10 of the agreement. The respondent will invoke the letter of credit available with them at any moment, if the amount is not paid by the applicant. Therefore, under these circumstances, the applicant has come before this Court by filing two applications as stated supra.

4. A common counter Affidavit is filed by the respondent wherein it is contended as follows:-

i) The respondent is Government of India undertaking. The above applications are totally misconceived based on the very fact that as per the agreement, the applicant is to pay mandatorily for the invoices raised by the respondent before invoking conciliation or arbitration. Therefore, no cause of action survives for the applicants to move these applications. Injunction against invoking bank guarantee can be issued by the Court only under two circumstances namely, fraud and irretrievable injury. The applicant has not alleged fraud nor any prima facie case of fraud is made out in the application. As per clause 15.11 of the agreement no payment due to the respondent shall be withheld by the applicant on account of pendency of legal proceedings.

ii). The respondent signed the gas supply agreement dated 07.07.2006 with ONGC for supply of APM gas for a period of 15 years. As per the Article 8 (take or pay obligation), the respondent is liable to off take 90% of the adjusted annual contracted quantity nominated by ONGC, failing which respondent/GAIL is liable to pay take or pay amount for the difference quantity. The respondent is supposed to pay the available amount due for the annual quantity deficiency within 7 days of the last day of the applicable financial year. The respondent signed Gas Sales and Transmission Agreement with various customers for supplying of natural gas. The said agreements are valid up to 31.12.2015. As per Article 5 of the said agreement, the buyer has to draw at least 90% of daily nominated quantities (minimum guaranteed off take/take or pay obligation) failing which the buyer is liable to pay for the difference of non-off take quantity on annual basis. The respondent shall raise minimum guarantee off take on customers on prorata basis only when ONGC claims the same from the respondent. The amount of take or pay difference quantity for each financial year is calculated by the seller namely, the respondent herein and raised at the end of the second fortnight of March of each financial year. The buyer is supposed to make payment within 4 days from the presentation of invoices. If no payment is made within the due date, the respondent can encash letter of credits and is at liberty to stop/regulate gas supply to the buyer

without any other notice. The relevant provisions of the agreement (GSTA) regarding minimum guarantee off-take (MGO) are 2.1, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 12.4, 12.5 and 12.6. Thus, in line of article 5 (5.2 & 5.4), on 07.08.2015, 24 Narimanam Zone Customers/Contracts were issued provisional MGO invoices without prejudice for Rs. 47,59,79,039/- towards minimum guarantee off-take for the contract year 2014-2015.

5. Mr. A.R.L.Sunderasan learned Senior Counsel appearing for the applicants in all these matters submitted as follows:

The dispute between the parties now is as to whether the applicants are liable to pay even for the gas not utilised. Whatever the quantum of gas supplied by the respondent, it will have to be taken by the applicants. From 2010 to 2014, there was no levy made in respect of the quantum of gas not supplied or utilised by these applicants. As per clause 15.10 of the agreement, even if there is any dispute, the respondent is obliged to continue the performance of the contract and therefore, they cannot stop the supply. The term "amounts due" referred to under clause 15.11 represents the amount for the supplied gas and not in respect of the amount which was disputed. As per clause 5.4(a) the claim made by the respondent is beyond time and therefore, the applicants cannot be compelled to pay for the quantum of gas not utilised. Consequently, the

respondent is not justified in invoking the letter of credit with the threat to stop the supply of gas to the applicants. However, without prejudice to the above contentions, all these applicants are willing to pay 25% of the disputed amounts to the respondents.

6. Mr. P.V.S.Giridhar, learned Counsel appearing for the respondent submitted as follows:

i) The supply is made by the respondent based on obligation on an annual basis. The quantity sought for is supplied by intimating the quantum in the previous night. For example, if the quantum supplied is 12,000 units and the buyer has utilised only 10,000 units, the balance 2,000 units goes waste as the gas will vanish. It is called flaring of gas, that means it goes into the atmosphere. The respondent made the present demand in dispute only when ONGC made a counter demand from the respondent. The invoices raised by the ONGC against the respondent are matter of record. The term "amounts due" referred to in clause 15.11 of the agreement includes the amount which is in dispute and therefore, the applicants are not correct in their contention. As per clause 12.6 the applicants are bound to pay even in respect of the disputed quantity.

ii) In so far as the applications filed against invoking of letter of

credits are concerned, the same can be considered only when there is a fraud and irretrievable injury raised and pleaded with facts. No pleadings regarding fraud is raised. The applicants are not put to irretrievable injury if the bank guarantees are invoked and on the other hand, if an injunction is granted, the same would cause irretrievable injury only to the respondent. Clause 15.10 of the agreement cannot be read in isolation and it has to be read along with clause 15.11. It is an admitted fact that the respondent is not supplying more than the quantity sought for. Therefore, the applicants are bound to pay for the quantity supplied irrespective of the fact whether they have utilised the full quantity or not. ONGC may terminate the supply to the respondent if payment is not made by the respondent to ONGC. In fact, all the bank guarantees are already invoked and only encashment of the same is due.

7. In support of the contention regarding the invocation of bank guarantee, the learned counsel for the respondent relied upon the decisions reported in **AIR 1997 SC 2477 & MANU/DE/1573/2015**.

8. Heard the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the applicants and the learned counsel appearing for the respondent. I have given careful consideration to all the facts and circumstances as well as the respective

pleadings of the parties and the relevant clauses in the agreement.

9. These applications are filed by invoking the jurisdiction of this Court under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act. The dispute between the parties is with regard to the demand made by the respondent in respect of quantum of gas supplied however, not utilised. It is not in dispute that the said issue is the main issue to be raised and decided under the arbitral proceedings. Both sides submit that as per Article 15 of the agreement, any dispute or differences or issues between the parties shall be referred to Conciliation. Clause 15.9 contemplates that any dispute arising in connection with the existing contract if not resolved by the parties through amicable settlement, the same shall be settled through Arbitration. Therefore, the issue is as to whether the applicants are bound to pay the amount in respect of the quantity of gas supplied but not utilised, is the question that need to be considered and decided in the Conciliation and Arbitral proceedings. As the parties have to go before the Arbitral proceedings in terms of the contract, this Court while exercising the power under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, cannot express any view on the merits of the dispute, as it would prejudice the mind of the Arbitrator.

10. However, for the purpose of considering these applications and to find out as to whether the applicants have made out a prima facie case for grant of interim orders as sought for in these applications, this court is not precluded from going into relevant clauses in the agreement. Before I refer to those clauses, I would like to reiterate that the present dispute is in respect of all the quantum of gas supplied by not utilised by the applicants. In other words, the dispute is not to the effect that the demand is made in respect of the quantum of gas not at all supplied. The above factual position is admitted by the learned senior counsel appearing for the applicants. It is also not in dispute that the supplied gas to the respective applicants, in turn was purchased by the respondent from ONGC and consequently, the respondent is to pay to the ONGC as and when any demand is made in respect of the gas supplied but not utilised. In other words, what is demanded by the ONGC from the respondent, in turn is demanded by the respondent from the applicants. With these factual background let me consider the relevant clauses in the agreement, which are as follows:

" 5.2 Take or Pay Quantity Obligation (TOPQ Obligation)

(a) Notwithstanding Article 12.5, Article 16, for each year for quantity mentioned under Article 5.1(a) there shall be an Annual "Take or Pay Quantity" to be taken or paid for it not taken by the BUYER to be calculated as follows:

Take or Pay Quantity = The BUYER shall pay to the SELLER for actual quantity of the Gas supplied by the SELLER to the BUYER subject to minimum payment for 90% of the annual quantities on the basis of the quantities mentioned in Article 5.1(c) hereinafter referred as Take or Pay Quantity. The BUYER guarantees to buy during every Financial Year such Take or Pay Quantity of Gas equivalent to the quantity obtained by multiplying 90% of the daily nominated quantity mentioned in Article 5.1(c) by the number of days in the Financial Year. Upon the BUYER failing to lift the aforesaid minimum guaranteed quantities of Gas during any financial year, the BUYER undertakes to pay for the said Take or Pay quantity for such Financial Year.

(b) Whenever, APM gas from ONGC available in a network/field and GAIL is not under obligation to pay MGO(TOP) to ONGC, GAIL shall not raise invoice for MGO(TOP) quantity. However, in cases where GAIL is obliged to pay MGO(TOP), the same shall be recovered on prorata basis subject to maximum of MGO(TOP) liability under respective contracts. No MGO(TOP) on gas price would be applicable individually to consumer (s) in the event the gas has been utilized in the network/field by other consumers and GAIL is not required to pay MGO(TOP) to ONGC.

12.6 In case of any discrepancy/dispute, regarding the invoices, the BUYER shall not return the bills or withhold or disallow part of full payment. After making the full payment the BUYER shall lodge a quantified claim with the SELLER within the period of 14

(fourteen) days from the date of receipt of the related invoices. To the extent the claim is admitted by the SELLER, the SELLER shall issue a credit note in favour of the BUYER and adjust the same in the next invoice to be raised. The SELLER undertakes to consider the claim of the BUYER within a period of 30 (Thirty) days from the receipt of such claim, if found acceptable. Failure of the BUYER to put forward any claim within the time above specified shall be an absolute waiver of any claim.

15.10) Continue performance

While any dispute under this Agreement is pending, for settlement before the Arbitration, the parties shall continue to perform all of their respective obligations under this Agreement without prejudice to the final determination in accordance with the provisions under this Article 15.

15.11) No payments due to the SELLER shall be withheld on account of such legal proceedings."

11. Perusal of Clause 5.2 would show that the GAIL namely the respondent herein is not under obligation to pay MGO(TOP) of ONGC whenever, APM gas from ONGC is available in a network/field. Thus in turn GAIL will not raise invoices for MGO(TOP) quantum on its buyers. However, where GAIL is obliged to pay MGO(TOP) to ONGC, the same shall be recovered from the buyers of the respondent on pro rata basis, subject to

maximum of MGO(TOP) liability. Therefore, this clause 5.2 makes it clear that the disputed amount claimed from the applicants is what the ONGC claims from the respondent. In this case, it is the contention of the applicants that till 2014 such invoices were not raised in respect of gas supplied but not utilised and that it is raised for the first time. It is also their contention that the agreement entered into between the parties is under protest in respect of the clause 5.2 as they were put to an disadvantageous position without having bargaining power. I am not able to agree to the said submission for the simple reason that the party who has entered into the agreement by signing the same without making any reference of protest or reservation in writing in the agreement, he cannot be heard to say at a later point of time that the same was signed under protest. Likewise the contention that GAIL did not raise such invoices till 2014 and is raising on the first time also cannot be countenanced, since if such right is available to GAIL under the agreement it cannot be found fault with in acting in accordance with the terms of such agreement.

12. Article 12 of the contract deals with billing and payment. Under the said article, clause 12.6 specifically contemplates that the buyer shall not return the bills or withhold or disallow part or full payment in case of any discrepancy/dispute regarding the invoices. The said clause further

contemplates that the buyers, after making the full payment, shall lodge a quantified claim with the seller within a period of 14 days from the date of receipt of the invoices in dispute. Therefore, when clause 12.6 in an unequivocal terms mandates the buyer to pay full payment in respect of the invoices raised even in the case of any discrepancy or dispute with regard to such invoices and thereafter, to make a claim with the seller, I do not think that the applicants are having any prima facie case before this Court to seek for the injunction against invoking the bank guarantees/letter of credits. In fact, the above said clause 12.6 is further strengthened under Clause 15.11 which contemplates that no payment due to seller shall be withheld on account of legal proceedings. However clause 15.10 mandates both parties that they shall continue to perform all of their respective obligations under the agreement without prejudice to the final determination, while any dispute under the said agreement is pending. What emerges from clause 15.10 is that even in case of any dispute with regard to the invoices raised by the respondent, the buyer shall pay the disputed amount and agitate the matter before the Arbitral proceedings while, the respondent is also mandated to continue the supply without prejudice to their rights to be determined in the Arbitral proceedings. Therefore clause 15.10 and clause 15.11 which deal with the obligation and counter obligations of the parties make the position very clear that the applicants have not made out a case

much less a prima facie case for granting the interim order against the invoking of bank guarantees.

13. An attempt is made by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the applicants to interpret Clause 15.11 to the effect that "payments due" referred to under the said clause does not mean and include payment under dispute and therefore the applicants are obliged to pay only the payments due where there is no dispute and they are not obliged to pay payments which are under dispute. I do not think that such an interpretation as sought for by the learned Senior Counsel is warranted or justified in these cases in view of the existence of a specific clause namely clause 12.6 dealing with payments even in respect of disputed invoices. I have already discussed what is contemplated under Clause 12.6 and its scope. Therefore, I find that the above contention raised by the learned Senior Counsel does not support the claim of the applicants even on a prima facie view.

14. It is well settled that as against invocation of bank guarantees the Court should show restraint in granting such interim orders unless fraud and irretrievable injury or injustice are pleaded and established. In these cases the applicants have not pleaded and made any allegation of fraud. Therefore, considering the fraud does not arise in these cases. What the Court now is to see as to whether irretrievable injury would be caused to

the applicants or they will be put to irretrievable injustice.

15. Discussion of the above stated facts and circumstances and consideration of various clauses contained in the agreement would show that not even a single clause in the agreement or a fact is showing a prima facie case in favour of the applicants. On the other hand, a combined reading of clause 5.2(b), 12.6, 5.10 and 5.11 of the agreement would show that if an injunction is granted, that would only amount to an irretrievable injustice only to the respondent as the period of contract is going to end on 31.12.2015. The respondent claims that what the demand made by them against the applicants is what the demand made by the ONGC against the respondent. Such contention of the respondent is not seriously disputed by the other side and on the other hand, it is only stated by the learned Senior Counsel for the applicants that the applicants are not in a position to controvert the above said contention. In view of the presence of clause 5.2(b) as discussed supra, I do not find that the above statement made by the respondent can be doubted. Further it is stated by the learned counsel for the respondent that such invoices made by ONGC against GAIL are matter of record. Therefore, when GAIL has to pay ONGC, automatically it follows that a counter demand has to be made by the respondent against the applicants. When that being the factual position, I am of the firm view

that granting of injunction would certainly prejudice the interest of the respondent to a grater extent and would amount to an irretrievable injury apart from causing irretrievable injustice.

16. The decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **AIR 1997 SC 2477(1)** was cited by the learned counsel appearing for the respondent to contend that irretrievable injury should be established and proved that there would be no possibility whatsoever, to recover the amount from beneficiary. I have already pointed out that irretrievable injury will not be caused to the applicants by refusing the injunction and on the other hand, it would cause irretrievable injustice and injury only to the respondent, if the injunction is granted against invocation of bank guarantee. The other decision reported in **MANU/DE/1573/2015** is also relied upon by the learned counsel appearing for the respondent to contend that under similar circumstances, the Delhi High Court has rejected the request for interim injunction against the bank guarantee.

17. Considering the above stated facts and circumstances, I am of the view that the applicants have not made out a prima-facie case and have not established that irretrievable injury or injustice would be caused to them if the injunction as against the bank guarantee is refused.

18. However, in respect of other applications seeking injunction against disconnection of gas supply are concerned, I am of the view that the respondent cannot discontinue the supply as per their counter obligation contemplated under Clause 15.10, provided the buyers pay the dues to them. As the applicants are disputing the invoices raised and not coming forward to pay the amount in full, without prejudice to their contentions before the Arbitral Tribunal, respondent is justified in invoking the bank guarantees.

19. I have already found that the respondent is bound to make their counter obligation as contemplated under clause 15.10 by supplying the gas continuously, even during the pendency of the dispute if the buyer pays the dues. So, in view of the fact that this Court has now rejected the injunction application against the invocation of bank guarantees and that the respondent has already invoked the bank guarantees and only the amount is to be encashed, I am of the view that, as a consequential obligation, the respondent is bound to continue the supply of gas to the respective applicants during the pendency of the Arbitral proceedings by collecting the amount due under such supply.

20. Accordingly, the Original Applications seeking injunction against invocation of Bank Guarantee in O.A.Nos. 834, 837, 839, 841, 854, 862, 863, 865, 867, 869, 872, 874, 875, 878, 879, 911 and 913 of 2015 are dismissed. The Original Applications seeking for continuous supply of gas in O.A.Nos. 833, 836, 838, 840, 853, 861, 864, 866, 868, 870, 871, 873, 876, 877, 880, 910 and 912 of 2015 are allowed. Consequently, Application No.5799 of 2015 is closed.

21. Since the dispute between the parties have to be finally decided by the Arbitral Tribunal, it is open to the parties to take appropriate steps as contemplated under the Agreement for referring the matter to the Arbitral Tribunal within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of the copy of this order.

09.09.2015

Index:Yes
Internet: Yes
rms

K.RAVICHANDRABAABU.,J.

rms

O.A. Nos. 833, 834, 836 to
841, 853, 854, 861 to 880
and 910 to 913 of 2015
and
A.No.5799 of 2015
in
O.A.No.912 of 2015

09.09.2015