



WEB COPY

1

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 20.08.2015

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.SUBBIAH

W.P. (MD) .No.15029 of 2015

Arangan

:Petitioner

vs.

1.The District Collector,
Pudukkottai District,
Pudukkottai.

2.The Block Development Officer,
Arimalam Panchayat Union,
Arimalam, Pudukkottai District.

: Respondents

Prayer: Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issue of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner, dated 17.08.2015.

For Petitioner :Mr.D.Rameshkumar
For Respondents :Mr.S.Kumar
Addl.Govt.Pleader

O R D E R

The Writ Petition has been filed praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner, dated 17.08.2015.

2. The case of the petitioner is that the 2nd respondent, by proceedings in Na.Ka.Thi.5/533/2015, dated 25.06.2015, under MNREG Scheme (Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme), proposed to construct a Village Panchayat Service Center Building (Electronic Service Center), for 31 Village Panchayats. Out of 31 Village Panchayats, except the petitioner Village viz., Melnilaivayal Panchayat, all other service centres are going to be situated in the respective village. Melnilaivayal Panchayat contains 5 small villages and one mother village, except the mother village, all other 5 villages are small villages, having rare transport facilities and more particularly, Regunathapuram Village, where the proposed service center is going to be situated. The said village is situated in a reserved forest area. The 2nd respondent, without visiting the said village, passed an order and provided the said service center at



Regunathapuram Village, which comes under Melnilaivayal Village Panchayat. The said Regunathapuram Village is surrounded by a reserved forest area and having 15 to 20 houses only. If the said service center is started in the said village, the purpose of the above said scheme would not reach the general public. Hence, the petitioner approached the 2nd respondent along with the Melnilaivayal Village Panchayat President and explained the situation about the proposed service center. Since there is no response from the 2nd respondent, the petitioner has made a representation, dated 17.08.2015, to the 1st respondent and the same was forwarded to the 2nd respondent. But the 2nd respondent has not taken any steps on the said representation. Hence, the petitioner has filed the present writ petition, for the relief stated supra.

3. I have heard the submissions made on either side and perused the materials available on record.

4. Considering the submissions made on either side, this Court, without going into the merits of the claim made by the petitioner, directs the 2nd respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner, dated 17.08.2015, and pass appropriate orders on the same, on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and all necessary parties

5. With the above direction, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (T&P)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The District Collector,
Pudukkottai District,
Pudukkottai.

2.The Block Development Officer,
Arimalam Panchayat Union,
Arimalam, Pudukkottai District.

+1cc to Mr.D.Ramesh Kumar, Advocate Sr.No.47971
+1cc to The Special Government Pleader Sr.No.48529

akm/15.09.15 /2p-5c/