

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30.08.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.VAIDYANATHAN

W.P.No.10358 of 2004

and

W.P.M.P.No.12077 of 2004

H.Habidabee

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Commissioner,
Madhavaram Municipality,
Chennai-60.

2. The Corporation of Chennai,
Represented by its Commissioner,
Chennai-600 003.

(The Second respondent suo motu impleaded
as per order dated 22.08.2017 in W.P.No.10358 of 2004)

.. Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for issuance of a Writ of Certiorari to call for the records on the file of the respondent in B.A.No.584/2003/C1 B.L.No.4/04, dated 27.02.2004 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : No appearance

For Respondents : Mr.P.P.Shanmuga Sundaram for R-1
Mr.V.C.Selvasekaran for R-2

ORDER

When the Writ Petition was taken up for hearing on 22.08.2017, there was no representation for the petitioner and hence, it was directed to be listed under the caption "for dismissal" today (30.08.2017). Even today, inspite of the matter being listed under the said caption, and called twice, there is no representation for the petitioner. Hence, the Writ Petition is dismissed for default. If any construction is made in the property in question in violation of the approved plan, it is open for the second respondent-Corporation of Chennai to take action to demolish the same. If the said action is not taken by the officials for violation of the approval plan, the said officials shall face capital punishment, i.e. dismissal

from service. No costs. W.P.M.P. is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS III)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar


CS

To

1. The Commissioner,
Madhavaram Municipality,
Chennai-60.
2. The Commissioner
The Corporation of Chennai,
Chennai-600 003.

W.P.No.10358 of 2004

kk(co)
aa22/09/2017



WEB COPY