

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14.06.2017

CORAM

THE HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE M.DURAI SWAMY

W.P.No.7621 of 2017

G.Subramanian

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The District Collector,
Office of the District Collector,
Ariyalur District.
- 2.The Director of Town Panchayat,
Office of the Town Panchayat Director's,
Kuralagam, Chennai - 104.
- 3.The Joint Director of Town Panchayat,
Office of the Town Panchayat of Joint Director,
Trichy.
- 4.The District Revenue Officer,
Office of the District Revenue Officer,
Udayarpalayam, Ariyalur District.
- 5.The Tahsildar,
Office of the Tahsildar,
Jayakondam, Udayarpalayam Taluk,
Ariyalur District.
- 6.The Executive Officer Town Panchayat/
Administrative Officer Town Panchayat,
Office of Town Panchayat,
Udayarpalayam, Ariyalur District.
- 7.The Village Administrative Officer,
Udayarpalayam, Ariyalur District.

... Respondents

Petition filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 01.02.2017.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.L.Rajesh

For Respondents : Mr.A.N.Thambidurai,
Special Government Pleader (R1 to R5)

Mr.P.S.Jayakumar (R6)

ORDER

The petitioner has filed the above Writ Petition to issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondents to consider the petitioner's representation dated 01.02.2017 and pass orders within a time frame.

2.It is the case of the petitioner that inspite of giving a representation dated 01.02.2017, the 6th respondent has not considered the same and passed orders so far.

3.However, Mr.P.S.Jayakumar, learned counsel appearing for the 6th respondent stated that the petitioner's representation dated 01.02.2017 was considered by the respondents 1 & 6 and orders were passed as early as on 20.05.2017 itself and therefore, nothing remains for adjudication in the Writ Petition. The 6th respondent has also filed his counter, wherein in paragraph-14, he has stated as follows:

“...

14.This respondent further submit that those disputed

shop in Ward No.14 has been removed by the 6th respondent as per the representation given by the petitioner. Thereby, there is no shop available in the petitioner's Ward No.14. Thereby, the petitioner's representation dated 02.02.2017 has been considered and passed orders, given reply to petitioner earlier through District Collector's Grievances Day Ariyalur and separately on 20.05.2017 also by way of two times. It is pertinent to point out that the petitioner mislead the Court by giving false information due to vegenic & thuorsly of money therefore the petitioner filed writ petition is invalid one and vexatious one and it is liable to be dismissed against the respondents."

4.In view of the averments stated in paragraph-14 of the counter filed by the 6th respondent, I do not find any reason to keep the Writ Petition pending for the reason that the 6th respondent had specifically stated that the respondents 1 & 6 have considered the petitioner's representation dated 01.02.2017 and passed orders as early as on 20.05.2017 itself.

5.In these circumstances, the Writ Petition stands dismissed as infructuous. No costs.

Index : No
Internet : Yes
va

14.06.2017

M.DURAI SWAMY, J.

va

To

- 1.The District Collector,
Office of the District Collector,
Ariyalur District.
- 2.The Director of Town Panchayat,
Office of the Town Panchayat Director's,
Kuralagam, Chennai - 104.
- 3.The Joint Director of Town Panchayat,
Office of the Town Panchayat of Joint Director,
Trichy.
- 4.The District Revenue Officer,
Office of the District Revenue Officer,
Udayarpalayam, Ariyalur District.
- 5.The Tahsildar,
Office of the Tahsildar,
Jayakondam, Udayarpalayam Taluk,
Ariyalur District.
- 6.The Executive Officer Town Panchayat/
Administrative Officer Town Panchayat,
Office of Town Panchayat,
Udayarpalayam, Ariyalur District.
- 7.The Village Administrative Officer,
Udayarpalayam, Ariyalur District.

W.P.No.7621 of 2017

14.06.2017

<http://www.judis.nic.in>