



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED 06.07.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM

W.P (MD) No.12541 of 2017

A.R.R.Ravisekar

..Petitioner

Vs.

The Commissioner,
Madurai Corporation,
Aringar Anna Maligai,
Madurai - 625 002.

..Respondent

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court, to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 17.06.2017 and direct the respondent to issue the deposit amount of Rs.7,07,984/- which was deposited by the petitioner, in the name and style of A.R.R.Ravisekar, Fourth Class Contractor. The petitioner's contract Licence No. ~~MD. G.M.~~ 4/23020/14 in registered No.2 for the public work for the period of 2009 to 2016, within the time limit stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Anbusaravanan
For Respondent : Mr.J.Gunaseelan Muthaiah
Standing Counsel

ORDER

Mr.J.Gunaseelan Muthaiah, learned Standing Counsel takes notice for the respondent Corporation.

2.By consent of both parties, the main Writ Petition is taken up for disposal, at the admission stage itself.

3. This Writ Petition has been filed by the petitioner for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondent, to consider the representation of the petitioner, dated 17.06.2017 and to direct the respondent to issue the deposit amount of Rs.7,07,984/-.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

4. The case of the petitioner is that he is a Fourth Class Contractor and the respondent Corporation has allotted works to



the petitioner, which were successfully completed by the petitioner. The petitioner would further state that he has deposited a sum of Rs.7,07,984/- at the time of allotment of works and after completion of works, he approached the respondent for return of the deposit amount. Since it is not considered, the petitioner gave a representation dated 17.06.2017 to the respondent. Since no favourable order was passed by the respondent, the present Writ Petition is filed.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court without going into the merits of the case, directs the respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner, dated 17.06.2017, on merits and in accordance with law, after providing opportunity of hearing to the parties concerned, within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

7. With the above direction, this Writ Petition stands disposed of. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-III)

/ True Copy /

Sub Assistant Registrar(C.S.)

KM/PM

MAS/MR-KKR/SAR2:21.07.2017:2P-1C

W.P (MD) No.12541 of 2017

06.07.2017(4/5)