



WEB COPY

1

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 13.02.2015

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE S.TAMILVANAN

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V.S.RAVI

Writ Petition (MD) No.1852 of 2015

K.Ramesh

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Director of Town and Country Planning,
O/o.Director of Town and Country Planning,
Kuralagam, Chennai.

2.The Assistant Director of
Town and Country Planning,
Dindigul Region,
Dindigul.

3.The Executive Officer,
Sevugampatti Town Panchayat,
Sevugampatti,
Dindigul District.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 2nd respondents to regularised the administration of the 3rd respondent by considering the petitioner's representation dated 18.03.2013 and letters issued by the 1st respondent to the 2nd respondent dated 17.12.2014 and 05.01.2015.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Santhana Krishnan

For Respondents 1&2 : Mr.A.K.Baskarapandian,
Special Government Pleader.

For 3rd Respondent : Mr.D.Muruganandam,
Additional Government Pleader.

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by **S.TAMILVANAN, J.**)

This writ petition has been filed invoking Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking an order in the nature of Writ of Mandamus directing the second respondent to regularize the administration of the third respondent by considering the petitioner's representation dated 18.03.2015 and the letters issued by the first respondent to the second respondent dated 17.12.2014 and 05.01.2015.



2. In support of his contention, learned counsel for the petitioner relied on a copy of the representation allegedly sent by the petitioner herein that is available at page 5 of the typed set of papers. We are of the view that the letter addressed by the petitioner would show that it is only for publicity and political interest rather than a real public interest. When a letter is addressed to the Hon'ble Chief Minister or any Officer, it must be addressed properly and it should not show any other colour. However, the manner in which the letter addressed by the petitioner dated 18.03.2013 which is available at page 5 of the typed set of papers would not show any public interest and similarly, there is no *prima facie* material to show that the third respondent is acting against directions of the respondents 1 and 2 and there is no need for the second respondent to give any further directions to the third respondent.

3. Having gone through the averments made in the accompanying affidavit, we are of the view that there is no public interest involved for seeking direction to the second respondent or the third respondent so as to pass any order invoking Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

4. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, we are of the view that the writ petition is not legally sustainable.

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

Sd/
Assistant Registrar

/True copy/

sub Assistant Registrar(c.s)

To

1. The Director of Town and Country Planning,
O/o. Director of Town and Country Planning, Kuralagam, Chennai.

2. The Assistant Director of Town and Country Planning,
Dindigul Region, Dindigul.

3. The Executive Officer, Sevugampatti Town Panchayat,
Sevugampatti, Dindigul District.

+1cc to Mr. P. Santhana Krishnan, Advocate in SR.No. 7253

TS/24.02.2015/2P-5C

Writ Petition (MD) No.1852 of 2015

13.02.2015