

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.07.2017

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE **M.DURAISWAMY**W.P.No.19358 of 2017
and W.M.P.No.20858 of 2017

N.S.R.Kishore Nagarur

[Petitioner]

Vs

1. State represented by its
District Collector,
Thiruvallur District.2. The Tahsildar,
Office of the Tahsildar,
Ponneri Taluk,
Thiruvallur District.

3. Bala

[Respondents]

Petition filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of Certiorari to call for the records pertaining to the impugned order made in Na.Ka.2758/2017/A1 dated 16.06.2017 passed by the 2nd respondent and quash the same

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Vijay Anand
For Respondents : Mr.S.N.Parthasarathi, GA

ORDER

Mr.S.N.Parthasarathi, learned Government Advocate, takes notice for the respondents 1 & 2. By consent, the main writ petition is taken up for disposal at the admission stage itself.

2. The petitioner has filed the above writ petition to issue a writ of certiorari to call for the records pertaining to the impugned notice dated 16.06.2017 passed by the 2nd respondent and to quash the same.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the 2nd respondent had issued the notice to the petitioner on 16.06.2017, calling upon him to appear before him for enquiry and for producing all the documents available with him on 28.06.2017. Challenging the said notice, the petitioner has filed the above writ petition.

4. Mr.S.N.Parthasarathi, learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 submitted that the relief sought for in the writ petition has become infructuous for the reason that the petitioner was called upon to appear on 28.06.2017 under the impugned notice dated 16.06.2017.

5. Having regard to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, the writ petition filed by the petitioner is liable to be dismissed on two grounds. Firstly, under the impugned notice dated 16.06.2017, the petitioner was called upon to appear on 28.06.2017, which date had expired long back. Secondly, the 2nd respondent had issued only a notice to the petitioner to appear before him for producing all the relevant documents to substantiate his case and since it is only a notice, I do not find any reason to

interfere with the same.


6. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. However, it is open to the petitioner to appear before the 2nd respondent and file his reply and putforth his case in accordance with law. No costs. Connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

28.07.2017

rg

To


1. State represented by its
District Collector,
Thiruvallur District.
2. The Tahsildar,
Office of the Tahsildar,
Ponneri Taluk,
Thiruvallur District.



WEB COPY

M.DURAISWAMY, J.

rg



W.P.No.19358 of 2017

WEB COPY

28.07.2017