

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08.12.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE RAVICHANDRABAABU

W.P.No.31863 of 2017

D.Devendiran

..Petitioner

vs.

1. The District Collector,
Nagapattinam Collector Office,
Nagapattinam,
Nagapattinam District.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Office of the Revenue Divisional Office,
Nagapattinam District,
Nagapattinam.

3. The Thasildar,
Office of the Thasildar,
Vedaranyam,
Vedaranyam Taluk,
Nagapattinam District.

4. The Village Administrative Officer,
Panchanathikulam Middle,
Vedaranyam Taluk,
Nagapattinam District.

... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus to direct the 3rd respondent to implement the proceedings of the 2nd respondent made in Na.Ka.No.001644/2015/A2 dated 14.07.2015 for taking action against the 4th respondent within stipulated time that may be fixed by this court.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Murugabharathi

For Respondents : Mr.P.Senthivel
Government Advocate

O R D E R

Mr.P.Senthilvel, learned Government Advocate takes notice for the respondents. By consent of the parties, the main writ petition is taken up for final disposal.

2. The petitioner seeks for a direction to the 3rd respondent to take action against the 4th respondent, based on the communication issued by the second respondent.

3. The grievance of the petitioner is that the ration card issued to the petitioner was cancelled based on the wrong information given by the 4th respondent, Revenue Inspector, while in fact, the petitioner is residing in the same address.

4. It seems that he has already given a complaint before the Revenue Divisional Officer, Nagapattinam, who in turn, directed the Tahsildar to look into the grievance of the petitioner. But the present request made through the representation dated 27.05.2017 is not for seeking issuance of ration card and on the other hand, for taking action against the 4th respondent on an allegation that the said official has given a wrong information. Whether the information given by such official is wrong or not is a matter of verification which cannot be decided, based on the petitioner's representation alone. Therefore, first the petitioner has to get the ration card issued in his name once again from the Revenue official and thereafter, seek appropriate remedy against the 4th respondent, if an occasion so arises. Without doing so, making the above complaint is not sustainable. Accordingly, I find no merits to entertain the writ petition. Hence, the writ petition is dismissed, however, by granting liberty to the petitioner to agitate the matter before the competent authorities for getting the ration card in his name, if he can able to prove his place of residence. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

vsi

To

1. The District Collector,
Nagapattinam Collector Office,
Nagapattinam,
Nagapattinam District.

2. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Office of the Revenue Divisional Office,'
Nagapattinam District,
Nagapattinam.

3. The Thasildar,
Office of the Thasildar,
Vedaranyam,
Vedaranyam Taluk,
Nagapattinam District.

4. The Village Administrative Officer,
Panchanathikulam Middle,
Vedaranyam Taluk,
Nagapattinam District.

+1cc to Mr.R.Murugabharathi, Advocate SR.No.88657
+1cc to Government Pleader SR.No.88142

W.P.No.31863 of 2017

GN(21/12/2017)



WEB COPY