



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20.04.2018

CORAM:

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.T. SELVAM
AND
THE HON'BLE MS.JUSTICE V.M.VELUMANI**

Review Aplw (MD) No.103 of 2015
in
WA(MD) No.1549 of 2011

I.Arulanandam .. Review Appellant/Appellant/Petitioner
Vs.

1. The Director of Rural Development,
Chennai.
2. The Project Director,
Vazhndhukattuvom Project,
91, St. Mary's Road,
Abiramapuram, Chennai-18.
3. The District Project Manager,
Vazhndhukattuvom Project,
Tirunelveli District ... Respondents/Respondents/Respondents

Review Application filed under Section Order 47 Rule 1 r/w
Section 114 of Civil Procedure Code, praying to review the order
passed by this Court in WA(MD) No.1549 of 2011 dated 25.09.2014.

Prayer in WA(MD).No. 1549/ 2011 :

Writ Appeal is filed under clause 15 of the letter patent
against the order dated 30/11/2011 in WP(MD).No.7106/2009 on the
file of this Court.

Prayer in WP(MD).No. 7106/ 2009 :

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the
Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of
Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records pertaining to the
order passed by the third respondent in his proceedings
Na.NO. A1-209-08 dated 30/01/2009 and quash the same and direct the
respondents to allow the petitioner to continue as facilitator.

For Applicant : Mr.Ganesan
for M/s.C.S.Associates

For Respondents : Mr.K.S.Suresh
Government Advocate - R1

**O R D E R**

Applicant filed WP(MD) No.7106 of 2009 seeking the following relief:-

"Praying to issue a writ of Certiorari and Mandamus, to call for the records pertaining to the order passed by the third respondent in his proceedings Na.No.A1-209-08 dated 30.01.2009 and quash the same and direct the respondents to allow the petitioner to continue as facilitator".

Learned Single Judge dismissed the said writ petition under orders dated 30.11.2011 holding that the writ petition was not maintainable. There against, the petitioner preferred WA(MD) No.1549 of 2011 and in dismissing the same under orders dated 25.09.2014, this Court has also considered the factual aspects and also informed as follows:-

"11. Therefore, it is clear that the project, to which the appellant was appointed was of a temporary nature and the appointment was to a society on contract basis. Hence, we find no reason to interfere with the order of the learned Judge."

2. It is not the appellant's case that such factual findings came to be made on erroneous understanding of the facts attending the case. When so, no occasion for review the order in WA(MD) No.1549 of 2011 arises.

3. This Review Application shall stand dismissed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-I)

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

The Director of Rural Development,
Chennai.

+1cc to Special Government Pleader, SR.No.62729.

Review Applw (MD) No.103 of 2015
20.04.2018

kmi

RAM/RSK/SAR 1/16.07.2018/2P/3C

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>