

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.3.2016

C O R A M

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE T.S.SIVAGNANAM

W.P.No.9121 of 2016

M/s. Lakshmi Sastry constriction Company
Rep.by V.K.Subramanian
New.No.16, Old No.12 -A
East Abhirampuram First Street
Mylapore, Chennai - 4

Petitioners

Vs

1. The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep.by its Secretary
Industries Department
Fort St.Goerge, Chennai -9
2. M/s. SIPCOT
Rep.by its Managing Director
No.19, Rukmani Lakshmipathi Salai
Chennai -8
3. The District Collector
Kancheepuram District
Kancheepuram.
4. The Special Tahsildar (LA)
SIPCOT - Oragadam Expansion Scheme,
Sriperumbudur Taluk
Kancheepuram District

Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 13-02-2015, within a time to be fixed by this Honourable Court.

For Petitioner ... Mr.M.Arvind Subramaniam

For R1, R3 and R4 ... Mr.J.Balagopal
Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

Heard Mr.M.Arvind Subramaniam, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.J.Balagopal, learned Additional Government Pleader accepting notice for the respondents 1,3 and 4, and with the consent of the learned counsel appearing on all parties, the writ petition is taken up for final disposal, at the admission stage itself.

2. The petitioner has filed this writ petition praying for issuance of a writ of mandamus to consider his representation dated 13.2.2015.

3. It is seen that the representation dated 13.2.2015 submitted by the petitioner was received by the District Collector, Kancheepuram, the third respondent and the same has been forwarded to the fourth respondent vide proceedings dated 09.3.2015 in Na.Ka.No.4630/2015 with a direction to the fourth respondent to consider the same and send appropriate reply to the petitioner with a copy marked to the third respondent. Even though one year has been lapsed from the date of such direction, till date, the fourth respondent has not informed the petitioner about the fate of his representation.

4. In the light of the above, without going into the merits of the contentions raised by the petitioner, there will be a direction to the fourth respondent to comply with the directions issued by the third respondent vide proceedings dated 09.3.2015 and inform the petitioner in writing as regards the representation made by him, within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

The Writ Petition is disposed of accordingly. No costs.

Sd/-

Asst.Registrar (CS IV)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

ga

To

1. The Secretary
Industries Department
Fort St.Goerge, Chennai -9

2. The Managing Director
M/s. SIPCOT
No.19, Rukmani Lakshmipathi Salai
Chennai -8

3. The District Collector
Kancheepuram District
Kancheepuram.

4. The Special Tahsildar (LA)
SIPCOT - Oragadam Expansion Scheme,
Sriperumbudur Taluk
Kancheepuram District

1 cc to Government Pleader, Sr. 16025

1 cc to Mr.Aravind Subramaniam, Advocate, Sr. 16143

W.P.No.9121 of 2016

RSY (CO)
kk 23/3



WEB COPY