

In the High Court of Judicature at Madras

Dated : 01.6.2016

Coram :

The Honourable Mr. Justice T.S. SIVAGNANAM

Writ Petition No. 2745 of 2015

M. Thenmozhi

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Commissioner,
Corporation of Chennai, Chennai-3.

2. The Revenue officer, Revenue
Department, Corporation of
Chennai, Chennai-3.

...Respondents

PETITION under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the second respondent - Revenue Officer, Chennai that existing account name of Thenmozhi in Zone 03 and Ward 046 has to be followed in Choolai and assess property tax Rs.157/- at the rate of per year.

For Petitioner : Mr. G. Ravi Shankar

For Respondents : Mr. B. B. Senthilkumar

ORDER

The petitioner seeks a direction to the second respondent to assess the property tax at the rate of Rs.157/- per year.

2. The case of the petitioner is that her residence comes within Zone III and Ward 46 of the Corporation of Chennai. However, she was directed to approach G3 Puliyanthope Division where she was informed that her house will not fall within Puliyanthope Division and she was asked to approach Choolai Division. According to the petitioner, she has been driven from pillar to post more than 50 times and ultimately, the petitioner, having not got any reprieve from any of the representations sent by herself or through counsel, has come to this Court by filing this writ petition.

3. Though the respondents have entered appearance through counsel, till date, no counter affidavit has been filed.

4. Considering the fact that the petitioner has not been favoured with a reply to any of the representations, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the second respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 18.6.2013 as well as the legal notice dated 19.12.2014, pass orders on merits and in accordance with law within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Before passing orders, an opportunity of personal hearing be granted to the petitioner. In the light of the fact that the respondents have not filed any counter affidavit disputing the averment made by the petitioner that she has been remitting the property tax at the rate of Rs.157/- and also for having given the cheque particulars, the second respondent is directed not to initiate any coercive action against the petitioner till the representation is considered in terms of the above direction. No costs.

rs

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Commissioner, Corporation of Chennai.

2.The Revenue officer, Revenue Department, Corporation of Chennai, Chennai-3.

KR/9/6/16

WP.No.2745 of 2015

WEB COPY