

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on 16.11.2017

Delivered on 23.11.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAVICHANDRABAABU

W.P.No.26156 of 2017

and

W.M.P.No.27794 of 2017

Dr.I.Savarimuthu

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. Thiruvalluvar University,
rep. by the Registrar,
Serkkadu,Vellore - 632 115.
2. The Returning Officer,
Syndicate/ Academic Council Election
Thiruvalluvar University,
Serkkadu, Vellore - 632 115.
3. The Principal,
St.Joseph's College of Arts and Science
(Autonomous),
St.Joseph's College Road,
Manjakuppam,
Cuddalore - 607 001.
4. Dr.T.Aasif Ahmed,
Assistant Professor of Economics,
S/o T.Anees Ahmed,
No.49, Muhamed Ali II Street,
Pernambut - 635 810,
Vellore District.
5. Dr.M.Nagarathinam,
Associate Professor of Chemistry,
D/o A.Mani,
No.5, Ramesh Mudaliyar Street,
Vallalar Nagar, Sainathapuram,
Vellore - 632 001.

6. Dr.K.Antony Baskaran,
Associate Professor of Commerce,
S/o M.Kulandaisamy,
No.8/1, Jason Cottage,
13th Street, EB colony, Kulinjur,
Vellore - 632 006.

7. Dr.S.Sridhar,
Assistant Professor of Botany,
No.18, Radhabai Nagar, Samuthram,
Nallavan Pallayam,
Thiruvannamalai - 606 603.

R4 to R7 are impleaded as per order dated
02.11.2017 by KRCBJ in WMP.No.29124/17 in
W.P.No.26156/2017

... Respondents

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records of the 2nd respondent pertaining to the proposed election to the Academic Council of Thiruvallurvar University from among the teachers of its affiliated colleges for the year 2017 and quash the certificate of scrutiny dated 18.09.2017 rejecting the nomination of the petitioner as illegal and direct the respondents to include the name of the petitioner in the list of valid candidates for the election to the academic council scheduled to be held on 28.10.2017.

For Petitioner: Ms.Arulmozhi

For Respondent : Mr.M.C.Swamy
Standing Counsel for R1 and R2
Dr.Xavier Arulraj,
Standing counsel for R3
Mr.S.Sathia Chandran for R4 to R7

O R D E R

The petitioner challenges the election to the Academic Council of Thiruvalluvar University for the year 2017 and the proceedings of the Returning Officer dated 18.09.2017 rejecting the nomination of the petitioner. Consequently, the petitioner seeks for a direction to the respondents to include his name in the list of valid candidates for the above said election which was scheduled to be held on 28.10.2017.

2. The case of the petitioner is as follows:

(i) The petitioner joined the 3rd respondent College as a lecturer and presently functioning as the Head of P.G. and

Research, Department of Commerce. Election to the Academic Council and Syndicate of the Thiruvalluvar University is being conducted once in three years. For the purpose of electing the members for the Syndicate/Academic Council elections are held for (i) Two members to the Syndicate are to be elected by the Principals of affiliated colleges from among themselves. (ii) Ten Principals of affiliated Colleges and ten teachers of affiliated and approved colleges other than the Principal of affiliated colleges are to be elected to the Academic Council from among themselves by means of the single transferable vote.

(ii) The petitioner decided to contest for the election to the member of the academic council and obtained permission from the 3rd respondent for the same. The 1st respondent published the electoral list on 29.07.2017 for the election, 2017, wherein there was an error of spelling in the petitioner's name. It was printed as 'Dr.I.Savaarimuthu' instead of 'Dr.I.Savarimuthu'. The said mistake was pointed out and communicated by the 3rd respondent to the 1st respondent by e-mail on 29.08.2017 and by post on 30.08.2017. As per the Schedule of the election, the petitioner filed his nomination on 15.09.2017 to the post of Academic Council member. Scrutiny was held on 18.09.2017 and the 2nd respondent informed the petitioner that there was an error of spelling in his name in the voters list and hence, he cannot accept the petitioner's nomination. Immediately, the petitioner gave his explanation stating that the mistake was already brought to the notice of the 2nd respondent by the 3rd respondent even before the issuance of election notification. The petitioner gave an objection also on the same day. However, the 2nd respondent rejected the nomination of the petitioner on the same day. Hence, the present writ petition.

3. The first respondent filed a counter affidavit wherein it is stated as follows:

The present writ petition is not maintainable as the same has been filed as an afterthought when the election process has already commenced. The petitioner has to work out his grievance only after the declaration of the election results. As early as on 08.09.2016, the University sent a communication to the Principals of all the affiliated/approved Colleges to submit the filled in Proforma in respect of the eligible, qualified teachers to prepare the voters list. The last date for submission of the filled in Proforma was fixed as 23.09.2016. Requests were made to extend the last date for submitting the filled in Proforma. Accordingly, it was extended upto 31.10.2016. Draft voters list was published on 05.01.2017 in the University website intimating the Principals of Colleges and giving them time upto 20.01.2017 to inform the University about the corrections, if any, to be made in the voters list. The last date for verification of voters list was extended upto 15.02.2017. The updated voters list was published on 27.07.2017

in the University website thereby giving one week time to communicate the changes, if any, by 03.08.2017. Thereafter, incorporating all the corrections in the voters list, the final list of voters was published on 29.08.2017. Therefore, the petitioner and his College had three opportunities to rectify/correct the mistake in the spelling of the petitioner. But neither the college nor the petitioner made the request. Atleast, the petitioner or his College could have responded to the communication dated 27.07.2017 and got the voters list corrected, which they have not done. The notification was published in the Tamil Nadu Government Gazette on 06.09.2017 with regard to the election to the Syndicate and Academic Council of the respondent University. The election process started with the issuance of gazette notification. The petitioner submitted the filled in Proforma dated 14.09.2016 through the Principal only on 21.10.2016. No communication was received from the Principal/ 3rd respondent with regard to any correction in the name of the petitioner till the publication of the final list of voters on 29.08.2017. Thereafter, no correction could be made. At the time of scrutiny of the nomination papers, it was found that the spelling of his name in his nomination varied from the final eligible voters list published on 29.08.2018. Therefore, the Returning Officer rejected the nomination of the petitioner. The election is being proceeded as per the schedule fixed in the notification after preparing the ballot papers and sending the same to the voters. Hence, the writ petition is liable to be dismissed as the petitioner has to work out the remedy available to him under the election law.

4. A rejoinder affidavit was filed by the petitioner dated 02.11.2017 stating that the spelling mistake in the name of the petitioner is an error committed by the University and not that of the petitioner. There was no other changes in the electoral number, college code, designation, Department, name of college and the place and district. Therefore, this error is immaterial which cannot be a reason to reject the candidature of the petitioner. There is no delay in approaching this Court. The writ petition will not become infructuous since this Court granted an interim direction on 11.10.2017 permitting the respondents 1 and 2 only to conduct the election and not to declare the result of the election.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner apart from reiterating the contentions raised in the affidavit as well as the rejoinder, further submitted as follows.

When the principal of the petitioner's college namely, the 3rd respondent has informed the mistake on 30.08.2017 itself well before the issuance of the notification for election, the mistake could have been rectified. In any event, the mistake /

error pointed out is negligible or minimal and therefore, it cannot be a reason for rejecting the nomination. The three members have given objection against the petitioner in the University letter head itself. Therefore, the University has acted against the petitioner with malafide. The Returning Officer ought to have exercised his options and accepted the nomination. In the absence of any other procedure prescribed under the Thiruvalluvar University Act, the Madras University Act which empowers the Returning Officer himself to postpone the election under the Representation of the People Act should have been taken note of to see that this type of mistake is not a bar and on that ground the nomination paper cannot be rejected. There is no other person called Savarimuthu available except the petitioner. In support of her contention, the learned counsel relied on AIR 1968 Delhi 110 (Madan Lal v. Hira Singh Pal), 2005(12) SCC 121 (Ram Bhual v. Ambika Singh and 2000(8) SCC 216 (Election Commission of India vs. Ashok Kumar). On the question of maintainability of the writ petition, the learned counsel relied on an unreported decision of this Court made in W.P.No.37681/202 dated 28.03.2013 and W.P.No.26064/2012 dated 02.11.2012.

6. Mr.M.C.Samy, learned counsel appearing for the respondent University, after reiterating the contentions raised in the counter affidavit, has further submitted as follows:

Even though enough time was given to the petitioner as well as the 3rd respondent college to point out the error if any in the voters list, they have not utilised such opportunity. Therefore, the petitioner cannot find fault with the action of the Returning Officer in rejecting the nomination papers. There is no malafide either pleaded or proved. The election process has already started and the election was also held in pursuant to the interim order granted by this Court and the counting and declaration of the results alone are to be completed. Any dispute with regard to the election has to be referred to the Vice chancellor as per University Regulation 50. In support of the above decision, learned counsel relied on 2001(8) SCC 509 (Shri Sant Sadguru Janardan Swami(Moingiri Maharaj) Sahakari Dugdha Utpadak Sanstha vs. State of Maharashtra) and AIR 2016 4 SCC 429 (Shaji K.Joseph v. v.Viswanath).

7. Mr.S.Sathia Chandran, learned counsel appearing for the respondents 4 to 7, who got themselves impleaded subsequent to the filing of the writ petition, submitted as follows:

These respondents have contested the election. The petitioner did not approach the Court in time. Once the election process has commenced, the petitioner is not entitled to file the writ petition, especially, when no steps have been taken to correct the mistake in the voters list by the petitioner and the 3rd respondent within the time given by the University. In

support of his contention, learned counsel relied on 2003(4) CTC 10(Mad.) (Prof.I.Elangovan vs. State of Tamil Nadu).

8. Heard Ms.A.Arulmozhi, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, Mr.M.C.Swamy, learned counsel appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 and Mr.S.Sathia Chandran, learned counsel appearing for the respondents 4 to 7 and perused the materials placed before this Court.

9. The point for consideration in this writ petition is as to whether the election process which has already commenced and reached the stage of polling of votes, need to be interfered with by this Court, at this stage, at the instance of the petitioner, whose nomination paper was rejected by the 2nd respondent/Returning Officer, on the reason that there is a variation in the spelling of the petitioner's name.

10. The case of the petitioner is that his name Dr.I.Savarimuthu is wrongly shown as Dr.I.Savaarimuthu in the voters list which according to the petitioner is not due to his fault but it is purely due to the mistake committed by the respondent University itself.

11. There is no dispute to the fact that the University sent communication to the respective colleges on more than one occasion calling upon them to inform the correction to be made in the voters list, if any, by extending the last date for verification of voters list then and there. It is not in dispute that the last date for verification of voters list was extended upto 15.02.2017 and the updated voters list was published on 27.07.2017 giving one week time for the colleges to communicate the changes, if any, by 03.08.2017. This is evident from the communication of the University dated 27.07.2017 addressed to the principal of the affiliated Colleges, which reads as follows:

No.TU/R/Conduct of AC & Syn. Election/2017/8352 dated 27.07.2017

To

The Principals of all affiliated Arts and Science Colleges of Thiruvallur University.

Sir/Madam,

Sub: Thiruvalluvar University, Vellore- Conduct of Election to the Academic Council / Syndicate - verification of the Voters List for corrections - reg.

I am by direction to state that the updated voter list has been prepared and available on the University

Website. I request you to verify the list and make corrections, if necessary and return the same with your remarks if any on or before 03.08.2017 without fail. If the voter list is not received by 03.08.2017 it will be presumed that you have no remarks to offer in respect of the particulars / details given in the voters list and the same will be approved by the University.

Yours faithfully,
REGISTRAR i/c

Copy to:

1. PA to Vice Chancellor/Registrar
2. File

12. A careful perusal of the above said communication would clearly indicate that it is for the respective College to verify the list and make corrections and return the same with their remarks on or before 03.08.2017. It is also stated therein that if the voters list is not received by 03.08.2017, it will be presumed that the respective college has no remarks to offer in respect of the particulars/ details given in the voters list and that the same will be approved by the University. The receipt of the above said communication from the University is not disputed. Therefore, it is for the 3rd respondent College to communicate the error, whether it is minor or major, to the University for rectification of such mistake in the voters list so that the final voters list could be prepared in order to conduct the election as per the schedule. Admittedly, the 3rd respondent college sent a communication, after nearly 27 days i.e., on 30.08.2017 and requested the University to carry out the corrections in respect of 10 persons, out of whom the petitioner is one among them. The said communication reads as follows:

Ref.No.SIC/2017-2018/1035
30.08.2017

Dated

To

The Registrar
Thiruvalluvar University
Serkkadu
Vellore - 632 115.

Respected Sir,

Sub: Correction in Electoral Name List - Reg.

Ref: Thiruvalluvar University website dated 29-08-2017

I bring to your kind notice that the names are incorrect in the Approved Staff List mentioned in the Electoral List of teachers affiliated and approved

colleges in the website (www.tvu.edu.in) of Thiruvalluvar University. Hence, I request you to carry out the correction in the name list of staff. Names of the staff which require correction are mentioned below:

Sl.No as per website	College code	Names as per website	Names to be corrected
208	107	Thiru.A.Lawrence	Thiru.A.Lawrance
228	107	Ms.P.Vaitianadane @ Anboundadane	Thiru.P.Vaitianadane @ Anbounadane
232	107	Dr.I.Savaarimuthu	Dr.I.Savarimuthu
242	107	Tmt.A.LoDepartment of Urdu Caroline	Tmt.A.Lourdu Caroline
245	107	Ms.A.Nirmala	Tmt.A.Nirmala
265	107	Tmt.Jeyanthi Ravichandran	Tmt.Jeyanthii Ravichandran
269	107	Ms.A.Arokiamary	Tmt.A.Arokiamary
273	107	Dr.S.Anjalmoose	Dr.S.Anjal Mose
293	107	Ms.Mercy Anthony	Tmt.Mercy Anthony
295	107	Thiru.A.Madeline	Tmt.A.Madeline

13. From the perusal of the above communication sent by the 3rd respondent, it is evident that the 3rd respondent was fully aware that the names found in the website electoral list in respect of 10 persons were incorrect and that the University has to carry out the correction as indicated in the said communication. Thus, it is admitted by the 3rd respondent that those 10 names were wrongly spelt out in the electoral list. Unfortunately, such communication was sent by the 3rd respondent, much after the cut off date, namely 03.08.2017, as indicated by the University in its communication dated 27.07.2017. Therefore, it is crystal clear that the mistake or error admittedly existed in the voter list, as admitted by the 3rd respondent, has not been corrected by taking appropriate steps within the time stipulated by the University before finalising the electoral list. Consequently, the final electoral list available before the returning officer, more particularly, in respect of the petitioner herein, is with some mistake and therefore, he cannot be found fault with, in exercising his

power to reject the nomination, based on such mistake. The petitioner, thus, is not entitled to contend that such mistake was pointed out well before the publication of the election notification and hence, his nomination ought to have been accepted. The question is not as to the entitlement of the petitioner to get the mistake rectified or corrected but it is the time within which he is entitled to exercise the same. 03.08.2017 was the list date for rectifying the mistake which the petitioner as well as the 3rd respondent college failed to utilise. Therefore, he cannot be heard to say that rejection of his nomination by the 2nd respondent is not correct and consequently on that reason, the entire election process has to be set aside. Moreover, this Court, while exercising the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot sit as the Election Tribunal and decide the merits of the order passed by the returning officer while rejecting the nomination papers so long as the decision making process was done strictly within his power. Except raising the above objection, the petitioner has not raised any other procedural flaw in conducting the election. Though a feeble attempt is made by the petitioner as though the University is acting with malice against the petitioner, I do not find any material averments to that effect in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, nor any other circumstances warranting such inference. No doubt, the learned counsel for the petitioner invited this Court's attention to the proceedings dated 18.09.2017 to contend as though three candidates who objected the nomination paper of the petitioner have given such objection in the letter head of the University itself and therefore, she sought to justify the allegation of malafide. A perusal of the said communication annexed in the typed set of papers filed by the University would show that it is nothing but a recording of the proceedings by the Returning Officer stating that those three candidates objected the nomination paper filed by the petitioner on account of difference in the name and spelling. Therefore, the Returning Officer having been appointed by the University, alone has used the letter head of the University and recorded such proceedings. I do not find anything wrong in recording such proceedings in such letter head even though those three objectors have signed in the very same proceedings.

14. Further, as pointed out by the learned counsel for the respondent University, Section 50 of the Thiruvalluvar University Act, 2002, deals with the dispute as to the Constitution of the University authorities and bodies which can be referred to the Chancellor. Therefore, the petitioner is not remediless.

15. Learned counsel for the petitioner relied on AIR 1968 Delhi 110 (Madan Lal v. Hira Singh Pal) which has arisen out of an Election Petition filed under Sections 81 and 85 of the

Representation of People Act, 1951 and the issue framed by the Court therein was as to whether the nomination papers filed by the petitioner therein were improperly and illegally rejected by the Returning Officer and if so, the election of the respondent is liable to be declared void on that ground. Therefore, it is evident that the said decision arising out of the Election Petition cannot be pressed into service at this stage, that too, in the present writ petition, especially, when such decision was made undoubtedly, in pursuant to conduct of trial. Certainly, the correctness or otherwise of the merits of the order passed by the 2nd respondent has to be tested by the writ petitioner only by filing the Election Petition in the manner known to law after declaration of the result.

16. The other decision of the Honourable Supreme Court reported in 2005(12) SCC 121 (Ram Bhual v. Ambika Singh) is also a case arising out of an Election Petition filed under Section 80 read with Section 81 of the Representation of People Act, 1951 and hence, the petitioner cannot rely on the same in this Writ Petition.

17. In 2000(8) SCC 216 (Election Commission of India v. Ashok Kumar), another decision relied on by the learned counsel for the petitioner, it has been observed at paragraph No.32 as follows:

32. For convenience sake we would now generally sum up our conclusions by partly restating what the two Constitution Benches have already said and then adding by clarifying what follows therefrom in view of the analysis made by us hereinabove:-

1) If an election, (the term election being widely interpreted so as to include all steps and entire proceedings commencing from the date of notification of election till the date of declaration of result) is to be called in question and which questioning may have the effect of interrupting, obstructing or protracting the election proceedings in any manner, the invoking of judicial remedy has to be postponed till after the completing of proceedings in elections.

2) Any decision sought and rendered will not amount to "calling in question an election" if it subserves the progress of the election and facilitates the completion of the election. Anything done towards completing or in furtherance of the election proceedings cannot be described as

questioning the election.

3) Subject to the above, the action taken or orders issued by Election Commission are open to judicial review on the well-settled parameters which enable judicial review of decisions of statutory bodies such as on a case of mala fide or arbitrary exercise of power being made out or the statutory body being shown to have acted in breach of law.

4) Without interrupting, obstructing or delaying the progress of the election proceedings, judicial intervention is available if assistance of the Court has been sought for merely to correct or smoothen the progress of the election proceedings, to remove the obstacles therein, or to preserve a vital piece of evidence if the same would be lost or destroyed or rendered irretrievable by the time the results are declared and stage is set for invoking the jurisdiction of the Court.

5) The Court must be very circumspect and act with caution while entertaining any election dispute though not hit by the bar of Article 329(b) but brought to it during the pendency of election proceedings. The Court must guard against any attempt at retarding, interrupting, protracting or stalling of the election proceedings. Care has to be taken to see that there is no attempt to utilise the courts' indulgence by filing a petition outwardly innocuous but essentially a subterfuge or pretext for achieving an ulterior or hidden end. Needless to say that in the very nature of the things the Court would act with reluctance and shall not act except on a clear and strong case for its intervention having been made out by raising the pleas with particulars and precision and supporting the same by necessary material.

18. The above observations of the Honourable Supreme Court would indicate that invoking of judicial remedy has to be postponed till after the completion of proceedings in election, if such election is to be called in question and which questioning has the effect of interrupting, obstructing or protracting the election proceedings in any manner. The Apex

Court has further observed that judicial intervention is available only if the assistance of the Court has been sought for merely to correct or smoothen the progress of the election proceedings, to remove the obstacles therein or to preserve a vital piece of evidence if the same would be lost or destroyed or rendered irretrievable by the time the results are declared and stage is set for invoking the jurisdiction of the Court.

19. In this case, this court finds that no procedural flaw on the conduct of the Election Officer in rejecting the nomination of the petitioner. Whether the reason set out in the rejection is correct or not is altogether a different matter for the petitioner to agitate by challenging the elected candidates, after declaration of the result, in a manner known to law. As long as the procedure adopted by the Election Officer is not in contravention of any law, this court, while exercising the discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, need not go into the merits of such order, as it is for the petitioner to agitate the same after declaration of the result by filing appropriate election petition. What is to be seen is as to whether any flaw exists in the decision making process and not in the decision itself. Therefore, I find that the above decision is also not helping the petitioner in any manner.

20. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent University relied on the following decisions. In 2001(8) SCC 509 (Shri Sant Sadguru Janardan Swami(Moingiri Maharaj) Sahakari Dugdha Utpadak Sanstha vs. State of Maharashtra) it is held that the High Court should not stay continuation of the election process even though there may be some alleged illegality or breach of rules while preparing the electoral rules. It is further held therein that once the result of the election is declared it would be open to the appellant therein to change the election of the Returning candidate by means of Election Petition before the Election Tribunal. In AIR 2016 4 SCC 429 (Shaji K. Joseph v. v.Viswanath), the Apex Court has held at paragraph No.15 as follows:

"15. In our opinion, the High Court was not right in interfering with the process of election especially when the process of election had started upon publication of the election programme on 27-1-2011 and more particularly when an alternative statutory remedy was available to Respondent 1 by way of referring the dispute to the central Government as per the provisions of Section 5 of the Act read with Regulation 20 of the Regulations. So far as the issue with regard to eligibility of Respondent 1 for contesting

the election is concerned, though prima facie it appears that Respondent 1 could contest the election, we do not propose to go into the said issue because, in our opinion, as per the settled law, the High Court should not have interfered with the election after the process of election had commenced. The judgments referred to hereinabove clearly show the settled position of law to the effect that whenever the process of election starts, normally courts should not interfere with the process of election for the simple reason that if the process of election is interfered with by the courts, possibly no election would be completed without the court's order. Very often, for frivolous reasons, candidates or others approach the courts and by virtue of interim orders passed by courts, the election is delayed or cancelled and in such a case the basic purpose of having the aforesaid reasons, this court has taken a view that all disputes with regard to election should be dealt with only after completion of the election."

21. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents 4 to 7 relied on the decision of this Court reported in 2003(4) CTC 10 (Mad.) (Prof.I.Elangovan vs. State of Tamil Nadu) wherein this Court even though has chosen to set aside the order rejecting the nomination of the petitioner therein, has not granted the consequential relief since the election had already started and final list of valid nomination was also declared.

22. Learned counsel for the petitioner wanted to rely upon the Madras University Act in support of her contention. Needless to say that the 1st respondent University is governed by its own Act viz., Thiruvalluvar University Act and therefore, what is contemplated under the relevant Act alone can be taken into consideration. Even otherwise, the relevant provision under the Madras University Act which empowers the Returning Officer to postpone the election, cannot come to the rescue of the petitioner as it is an admitted case that neither the petitioner nor the 3rd respondent has chosen to rectify the mistake within the cut off date given by the University before preparing the final voters list. When such being the factual position, it is not the role or duty of the Election Officer to take note of any error in the voters list and rectify or correct the same or to postpone the election at the instance of the petitioner, especially when he has miserably failed to comply with the requirements within the cut off date.

23. Therefore, for all these reasons, I do not find any merit in this writ petition. The writ petition fails and the same is dismissed, however, by granting liberty to the petitioner to work out his remedy in a manner known to law after the declaration of results. Consequently, the interim order granted is vacated and the connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

vsi

To

1. The Registrar,
Thiruvalluvar University,
Serkkadu,
Vellore - 632 115.06.2017
2. The Returning Officer,
Syndicate/ Academic Council Election
Thiruvalluvar University,
Serkkadu, Vellore - 632 115
3. The Principal,
St. Joseph's College of Arts and Science
(Autonomous),
St. Joseph's College Road,
Manjakuppam,
Cuddalore - 607 001.

+1cc to Mr.M.C.SWAMY Advocate, S.R.No. 83204

+1cc to Mr.S.SATHIA CHANDRAN Advocate, S.R.No. 83555

+1cc to Mr.A.ARUL MOZHI Advocate, S.R.No. 83774

W.P.No.26156 of 2017

TR(30/11/2017)