



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 11.03.2015

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAVICHANDRA BAABU

Review Petition (MD).No.15 of 2015
in

W.P.(MD).No.21031 of 2014

The Managing Director,
Southern Railway Employees
Cooperative Credit Society Limited,
Tiruchirappalli. : Review Petitioner/2nd respondent

vs.

1.R.Saravanan :1st respondent/writ petitioner

2.The Central Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
Krishi Bhavan,
New Delhi. :2nd respondent/1st respondent

PRAYER: Petition filed under order 47 Rule 1 r/w Section 114(2) of Civil Procedure Code seeking to review the order of the court dated 12.01.2015 made in W.P.(MD).No.21031 of 2014.

Prayer in WP(MD). 21031/ 2014 :

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records pertaining to the Impugned order dated 15.12.2014 passed by the 2nd Respondent herein in his Office Order No.68 and quash the same.


For Petitioner : Mr.R.Muthu Kumarasamy Senior counsel
for M/s.A.Janasenan
For Respondents : Mr.Raja Jeyachandrapaul
for R-1
Mr.G.R.Swaminathan for R-2
Assistant Solicitor General of India

O R D E R

Learned counsel Mr.Raja Jeyachandrapaul takes notice for the first respondent, who is the writ petitioner in W.P.(MD).No.21031 of 2014.

2.By consent, the main review petition is taken up for final disposal.

3.Mr.K.Muthukumarasamy, learned senior counsel appearing for the review petitioner fairly submitted that though this review is filed raising very many grounds on the merits of the order passed by this Court, he is confining his submissions only on the question of jurisdiction of this court to entertain the writ petition. Thus, he submitted that the order passed by this Court need not be reviewed in its entirety and if the question of maintainability is left open to be adjudicated in appropriate proceedings, it would suffice for the purpose of this review.



4. In fact, this Court has not interfered with the impugned order of transfer in the writ petition and on the other hand, only directed the second respondent therein, who is the review petitioner herein, to keep the said order in abeyance for a period of six months. It is true that this Court has not gone into the issue with regard to the maintainability of the writ petition. Therefore, the issue with regard to the maintainability of the writ petition is left open to be adjudicated in appropriate proceedings. In all other aspects, the order passed by this Court in W.P.(MD).No.21031 of 2014 stands.

5. With the above observation, this review petition is disposed of.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(Writs)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To
The Central Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi.

+1CC to M/s.S.Raja Jeyachandra Paul, Advocate in SR.11878

+1CC to M/s.S.Senthuraman, Advocate in SR.11759

Review Application (MD).No.15 of 2015
11.03.2015

vs

PBK 19/03/2015 ::2P-4C: