



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 06.09.2017

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **R.MAHADEVAN**

W.P(MD)No.15863 of 2017

Parimala

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Inspector of Village Panchayaths/District Collector,
Pudukkottai District, Pudukkottai.

2.The Additional Director (Village Panchayath),
Pudukkottai, Pudukkottai District.

3.The Block Development Officer,
Ponnamaravathy Panchayath Union,
Ponnamaravathy, Pudukkottai District.

4.Natarjan

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the first respondent to direct the third respondent to reinstate the petitioner's name instead of the names of the fourth respondent and his wife in the tax assessment of the petitioner's house Door Nos.516 and 517 of Thottiyampatty Village Panchayat, Ponnamaravathy Taluk, Pudukkottai, based on her representations dated 17.10.2014 and 20.07.2017.

For Petitioner

: Mr.S.Muthalraj

For Respondents 1 to 3

: Mr.M.Alagathevan,
Special Government Pleader.

ORDER

This writ petition is filed seeking a writ of Mandamus to direct the respondents 1 and 3 to reenter the name of the petitioner instead of the names of the fourth respondent and his wife in the tax assessment of the petitioner's house bearing Door Nos.516 and 517, Thottiyampatty Village Panchayat, Ponnamaravathy Taluk, Pudukkottai, based on her representations dated 17.10.2014 and 20.07.2017, within the time stipulated by this Court.

2.Heard both sides.

3.The case of the petitioner is that she purchased the house bearing Door Nos.516 and 517, Thottiyampatty Village Panchayat, Ponnamaravathy Taluk, Pudukkottai and she is paying local taxes to the Village Panchayat in her name. According to the petitioner, the fourth respondent and her wife fraudulently changed the assessment



in respect of the said house, in their names. Therefore, she made several representations to the official respondents right from the year 2014 and finally on 20.07.2017, which have not been considered so far. Therefore, the petitioner is before this Court.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the fourth respondent is the contesting party, to whom, notice was already served, but appearance was not made. He further submitted that it would be suffice, if the representation of the petitioner, dated 20.07.2017, is disposed of by the third respondent as per law.

5.Considering the limited scope of the relief sought for, this Court, without going into the merits of the petitioner's claim, directs the third respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 20.07.2017, and pass appropriate orders on its own merit and in accordance with law, after affording due opportunity of hearing to the petitioner as well as any of the interested parties including the fourth respondent, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

6.The writ petition is disposed of as above. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(AD-II)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

- 1.The Inspector of Village Panchayaths/District Collector,
Pudukkottai District, Pudukkottai.
- 2.The Additional Director (Village Panchayath),
Pudukkottai, Pudukkottai District.
- 3.The Block Development Officer,
Ponnamaravathy Panchayath Union,
Ponnamaravathy, Pudukkottai District.

+1cc to Mr.NA.PALANIYANDI Advocate in SR. No. 76843

+1cc to THE SPECIAL GOVERNMENT PLEADER in SR. No. 77664

SMN

JS/JC/SAR.4/19.09.2017/2P-6C