

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.09.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.35645 of 2004

Rajakannu

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.District Collector,
Thiruvannamalai District.

2.The Commissioner,
Kalasapakkam Panchayat Union,
Polur Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District.

... Respondents

Prayer:

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records relating to the proceedings in Na.Ka.A2/1117/2003 dated 26.10.2004 from the file of the 2nd respondent and quash the same and directing the 2nd respondent to include the name of the petitioner in the panel list of contractors maintained by Kalasapakkam Panchayat Union.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Margabandu
For Respondents : Mrs.K.Bhuvaneswari for R1
Government Advocate
Mr.V.Subbarrayan for R2

O R D E R

The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking issuance of Writ

of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records relating to the proceedings in Na.Ka.No.A2/1117/2003 dated 26.10.2004 from the file of the second respondent and to quash the same and to further direct the second respondent to include the name of the petitioner in the panel list of contractors maintained by Kalasapakkam Panchayat Union.

2.Heard the arguments advanced on either side.

3.The petitioner challenges the order dated 26.10.2004, wherein, his name was removed from the contractor's list. The brief facts of the case are as follows: The petitioner is a registered Contractor in Kalasapakkam Panchayat Union for several years. Due to the mis-understanding between the petitioner and the Chairman of the Panchayat Union and in order to settle the wreck vengeance, he created some records against the petitioner and placed them before the Panchayat Union Council and after approval removed the petitioner from the list of Panchayat Union Contractors, against which, the present writ petition is filed.

4.However, the impugned order was passed on 26.10.2004. Thereafter, several local body elections were conducted and the

learned counsel appearing for the petitioner reports that he was not able to contact his client and get instructions as to the present stage. Hence, after a lapse of nearly fourteen years, I do not think that anything would survive for adjudication in this writ petition.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed as nothing survives for adjudication in this writ petition. No costs.

15.09.2017


pri
Speaking Order/ Non Speaking Order
Index: Yes/ No Internet: Yes/ No

To

1. The District Collector,
Thiruvannamalai District.
2. The Commissioner,
Kalasapakkam Panchayat Union,
Polur Taluk, Thiruvannamalai District.

सत्यमेव जयते
WEB COPY

M.DHANDAPANI,J.
pri



W.P.No.35645 of 2004

WEB COPY

15.09.2017