



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 17.02.2015

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE B.RAJENDRAN

Writ Petition (MD)No.19365 of 2014

WEB COPY

C.KARUPPAN @ KARUPPASAMY

..Petitioner

Vs.

1. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
COLLECTORATE COMPLEX,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT,
TIRUNELVELI.

2. THE PROJECT DIRECTOR,
DISTRICT RURAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ,
COLLECTORATE COMPLEX, TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT,
TIRUNELVELI.

3. THE BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICER,
KEZHAPAVUR, TENKASI TALUK,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

4. THE PRESIDENT,
THIPPANAMPATTI VILLAGE PANCHAYAT,
TENKASI TALUK,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

..Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records of the 3rd respondent order in A3/4698/2011 dated 14.02.2012 and quash the same and direct the 3rd respondent to sanction the amount of Rs.2,10,000/- and other construction materials within the period stipulated by this Honourable Court.

For petitioner ... Mr.A.Haja Mohideen
For R1 & R2 ... Mr.S.Chandrasekar
Government Advocate
For R3 & R4 ... Mr.R.Velmurugan

O R D E R

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned counsel appearing for the respondents.

2. The writ petition has been filed challenging the impugned order, dated 14.02.2012 cancelling the allotment of the green house scheme. The petitioner is aggrieved against that order, because the respondents have suddenly stopped the very order. Subsequently, the petitioner made a representation to the respondents, dated 22.04.2013 stating that his daughter is a physically handicapped person. His representation was rejected on the ground that his wife is working as a Government servant and that the scheme will not applicable to his family. Therefore, the present writ petition is filed.



3. As rightly pointed out by the learned Government Advocate, the petitioner's wife is working as a Noon Meal Helper and she is working under the Government. Therefore, the benevolent scheme will not be applicable to the petitioner's family and on that ground alone his allotment was cancelled originally in the year 2012 itself. Subsequently, the petitioner made representation that his daughter is a physically handicapped. Again, the representation of the petitioner was rejected on the same ground.

4. Since the original allotment order was cancelled on the ground that the petitioner's wife is working as a Government servant and that the scheme will not be applicable to the petitioner's family, there is nothing wrong in the impugned order of the third respondent dated 14.02.2012.

5. In the result, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
COLLECTORATE COMPLEX,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT,
TIRUNELVELI.
2. THE PROJECT DIRECTOR,
DISTRICT RURAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ,
COLLECTORATE COMPLEX, TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT,
TIRUNELVELI.
3. THE BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICER,
KEZHAPAVUR, TENKASI TALUK,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.
4. THE PRESIDENT,
THIPPANAMPATTI VILLAGE PANCHAYAT,
TENKASI TALUK,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

+1cc to Mr.R.Velmurugan, Advocate in SR.7670

+1cc to Mr.A.Haja Mohideen, Advocate in SR.7681

W.P. (MD) No.19365 of 2014
17.02.2015

rj2

pbk 26/02/2015 ::2p-7c: