

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.09.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.18445 of 2004

and

W.P.MP.No.21968 of 2004

R.Chockalingam ... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Joint Registrar of
Co-Operative Societies,
Pudukkottai,
Pudukkottai District.

2. The Deputy Registrar of
Co-Operative Societies,
Pudukkottai,
Pudukkottai District.

3. M.M.373 Narthamalai Primary
Agricultural Co-operative Bank Ltd.,
Rep.by its Special Officer,
Narthamalai,
Pudukkottai District.

... Respondents

Prayer: The writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a writ of Certiorari, calling for records on the file of the respondents relating to the impugned order of the third respondent dated 23.05.2004 and quash the same in so far as the petitioner is concerned.

For Petitioner : M/s.Aiyar and Dolia

For Respondents : Mr.L.P.ShanmugaSundaram
Special Government Pleader
for Co-Operative Societies
for R1 and R2
Mr.C.Prakasam for R3

O R D E R

The petitioner has filed this writ petition, challenging the order of reversion passed by the Special Officer.

2.A Larger Bench of this Court in its decision reported in 2006 (4) CTC 689 (K.Marappan Vs. The Deputy Registrar of Co-operative Societies, Namakkal), has decided whether writ will lie against a Co-operative Society and has held as follows:

"21. From the above discussion, the following propositions emerge:-

(i) If a particular co-operative society can be characterised as a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution (applying the tests evolved by the Supreme Court in that behalf), it would also be 'an authority' within the meaning and for the purpose of Article 226 of the Constitution. In such a situation, an order passed by a society in violation of the bye-laws can be corrected by way of writ petition;

(ii) Applying the tests in Ajay Hasia it is held that a co-operative society carrying on banking business cannot be termed as an instrumentality of the State within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution;

(iii) Even if a society cannot be characterised as a 'State' within the meaning of Article 12 of the Constitution, a Writ would lie against it to enforce a statutory public duty cast upon the society. In such a case, it is unnecessary to go into the question whether the society is being treated as a 'person' or 'an authority' within the meaning of Article 226 of the Constitution and what is material is the nature of the statutory duty placed upon it and the Court will enforce such statutory public duty. Although it is not easy to define what a public function or public duty is, it can reasonably said that such functions are similar to or closely related to those performable by the State in its sovereign capacity.

(iv) A society, which is not a 'State' would not normally be amenable to the

writ jurisdiction under [Article 226](#) of the Constitution, but in certain circumstances, a writ may issue to such private bodies or persons as there may be statutory provisions which need to be complied with by all concerned including societies. If they violate such statutory provisions a writ would be issued for compliance of those provisions.

(v) Where a Special Officer is appointed in respect of a co-operative society which cannot be characterised as a 'State' a writ would lie when the case falls under Clauses (iii) and (iv) above.

(vi) The bye-laws made by a co-operative society registered under the Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1983 do not have the force of law. Hence, where a society cannot be characterised as a 'State', the service conditions of its employees governed by its bye-laws cannot be enforced through a writ petition.

(vii) In the absence of special circumstances, the Court will not ordinarily exercise power under [Article 226](#) of the Constitution of India when the Act provides for an alternative remedy.

(viii) The decision in [M.Thanikkachalam v. Madhuranthagam Agricultural Co-operative Society](#), 2000 (4) CTC 556 is no longer good law, in view of the decision of the seven-Judge Bench of the Supreme Court in Pradeep Kumar Biswas case and the other decisions referred to here before."

3. Accordingly, this petition is disposed of with a liberty to the petitioner to work out his remedy in the manner known to law. Consequently, connected miscellaneous application is closed. No costs.

Sd/
Assistant Registrar

/True copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To.

1. The Joint Registrar of Co-Operative Societies,
Pudukkottai District.

2. The Deputy Registrar of Co-Operative Societies,
Pudukkottai District.


3. The Special Officer,
M.M.373 Narthamalai Primary Agricultural
Co- operative Bank Ltd.,
Narthamalai, Pudukkottai District.

+1cc to Mr.C.Prakasam, Advocate sR.No.68997/17

+1cc to R.Arumugam, Advocate SR.No.68326/17

W.P.No.18445 of 2004

SDR 23.10.2017



WEB COPY