

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.08.2016

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.JAICHANDREN

W.P.No.28997 of 2014

1. Kanniyappa Udayar [Deceased]
2. Parvatham
3. Malliga
4. Kamatchi
5. Ravi
6. Ganapathi
7. Srinivasan
8. Krishnaveni
9. Govindan
10. Indira

..Petitioners

[Petitioners 2 to 10 are substituted as legal heirs of deceased 1st petitioner -Kanniyappa Udayar as per order of this Court dated 11.08.2016 in W.M.P.No.10984 of 2016 in W.P.No.28997 of 2014]

vs.

1. The District Collector
Kancheepuram District
Kancheepuram.
2. The Superintendent of Police
Kancheepuram District
Kancheepuram.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Madurantakam Taluk
Kancheepuram District.
4. Poonkodi
5. Kannan
6. Raja
7. Kavitha
8. Shanmugam
9. Dakshinamoorthy
10. Pushpa
11. Shankar
12. Vellaiya Udayar
13. Devaraj
14. Murugan
15. Ponnivel Udayar
16. Perumal

.. Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 3 to take action against the respondents 4 to 16 on the basis of the petitioner's representation dated 24.09.2014.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Chandrakanthan

For Respondents : Mr.K.Dhananjayan
Special Government Pleader
for RR1 to 3
Mr.A.Rajesh Kanna
for R11 to R16
RR4 to 10 - No appearance

ORDER

Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, as well as the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the respondents.

2. At this stage of the hearing of the writ petition, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents 11 to 16 had submitted that the deceased petitioner, viz., Kanniyappa Udayar, had filed the suit, in O.S.No.19 of 2011, on the file of the District Munsif Court, Madurantagam, praying for a decree of permanent injunction against the respondents 11 to 16. The said civil suit is pending disposal. While so, the erstwhile petitioner had also obtained an order from this Court, in CrI.O.P.No.23788 of 2014, wherein, by an order dated 03.09.2014, the respondents therein had been directed to deal with the complaint received from the erstwhile petitioner, in accordance with the directions issued by the Supreme Court, in Lalita Kumari vs. Government of Uttar Pradesh and others, reported in (2014) 2 SCC 1. It has also been stated that certain orders had been obtained by the erstwhile petitioner, in S.A.No.729 of 2007, before this Court.

3. In such circumstances, this Court does not find it appropriate to grant the relief prayed for by the petitioner. Hence, the writ petition stands dismissed. However, it may be open to the petitioners to seek their reliefs, if any, before the appropriate forum, in the manner known to law. No costs.

vj2

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar


To

1. The District Collector
Kancheepuram District
Kancheepuram.
2. The Superintendent of Police
Kancheepuram District
Kancheepuram.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer
Madurantakam Taluk
Kancheepuram District.

+ 1 cc to Mr.A.Rajesh Kanna, Advocate Sr 46016
+ 1 cc to Mr.V.Chandrakanthan, Advocate Sr 46272
+ 1 cc to The Govt.Pleader, Sr 46278

KR/3/9/16

W.P.No.28997 of 2014



WEB COPY