



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 05.12.2016

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAVICHANDRA BAABU

W.P(MD)No.559 of 2015

Vasantha

.. Petitioner

vs.

The District Forest officer,
Old Palace,
District Forest Office,
Pudukkottai District.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a writ of Mandamus directing the respondent to issue the license to the petitioner's saw mill under the Tamil Nadu Regulation of Wood based Industries Rules 2010 by considering the petitioner's application and also the petitioner's registered representation dated 17.03.2014 within a time stipulated by this Honourable Court.

For Petitioner : Mr. K. Baalasundharam
For Respondent : Mr. A. Muthukaruppan,
Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

The petitioner seeks for a mandamus directing the respondent to issue license to the petitioner's saw mill under the Tamil Nadu Regulation of Wood Based Industries Rules, 2010 by considering the petitioner's application and also the petitioner's registered representation dated 17.03.2014 within a time stipulated by this Honourable Court.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The grievance of the petitioner is that the petitioner's application and also his representation dated 17.03.2014 seeking for issuance of license to run the Saw Mill under the Tamil Nadu Regulation of Wood Based Industries Rules, 2010, has not been considered so far.

4. In the counter affidavit filed by the respondent, it



is stated that the petitioner's representation along with 19 others were sent to Conservator of Forest, who, in turn through proceedings dated.18.08.2012 returned all those applications referring to the proceedings of the Principal Chief Conservator of Forest, Chennai, dated 28.07.2011, which in turn referred to the report of the Central Empowered committee dated 13.05.2011, wherein it is stated that consideration of such request for establishment of any post 30th October, 2002 will be made only by the Central Empowered Committee.

5. Even though it is stated so in the counter affidavit, admittedly, the petitioner has not been served with the order passed on his application so far. It is for the respondent to pass an order on the application with reasons. If the petitioner is aggrieved by the said order, it is for him to challenge the same in the manner known to law. Therefore, the respondent is directed to pass orders on the petitioner's application within a period of four weeks and communicate the same to the petitioner.

6. With the above direction, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To,
The District Forest officer,
Old Palace, District Forest Office,
Pudukkottai District.

+1 cc to MR.K.BALASUNDHARAM, Advocate SR.No.79579

+1 cc to Special Government Pleader SR.No.79858

W.P(MD)No.559 of 2015
05.12.2016

SMA/PM/29.12.2016:2P/4C