

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Orders Reserved on : 11..09..2018

Orders Pronounced on : 23..11..2018

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.BHARATHIDASAN

Writ Petition No.32285 of 2004

and

W.M.P.No.39086 of 2004

T.Mohanarangam

... Petitioner

-Versus-

- 1.The Government of Tamil Nadu,
(Municipal Administration & Water
Supply Department),
Rep. by its Special Commissioner &
Secretary to Government,
Fort. St. George,
Chennai 600 009.
 - 2.The District Collector,
Tiruvallur District.
 - 3.The Executive Engineer,
Madras Metropolitan Water Supply &
No.1, Pumping Station Road,
Chintadripet, Chennai 600002.
 - 4.The Special Tahsildar,
(Land Acquisition),
No.1, Pumping Station Road,
Chintadripet, Chennai 600002.
- ... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to the Land Acquisition Proceedings, (Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department) in G.O.Ms.No.316, dated 10.09.2004 and G.O.Ms.No.325, dated 05.10.2004 on the file of the respondents in respect of lands belonging to the petitioner in S.No.136/1 - Acre 5.25 Acres, S.No.136/2 - Acre 6.41 Acres, S.No.137/3 - Acre 0.20 Acres and S.No.138/4B - Acre 0.80 Acres totaling about Acre 12.66 Acres situate in No.65, Chembarambakkam Village, Poonamallee Taluk, Tiruvallur District and to quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mrs.C.R.Rukmani
For Respondents : Mr.C.Thirumaran, Spl.
Govt. Pleader for R1 &
R2
Mr.N.Ramesh, Standing
Counsel for R3 & R4

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed challenging the validity of the Notification issued by the 1st respondent in G.O.Ms.No.316, Municipal Administration and Water Supply (Metro Water), 9th September, 2004 for the acquisition of lands in No.65, Chembarambakkam Village, Poonamallee Taluk, Tiruvallur District, for a public purpose to wit for the construction of treatment plant by Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board and the consequential Notification of Declaration issued in G.O.Ms.No.325, Municipal Administration and Water Supply (Metro Water), dated 5th October, 2004.

2. The case of the petitioner, in brief, is as follows:- The petitioner is the absolute owner of the lands comprised in S.No.136/1, 136/2, 137/3 and 138/4B measuring a total extent of 12.66 Acres. He is an agriculturist and has been doing cultivation in an extent of about 5.25 Acres in S.No.136/1 and in the remaining land, he has been carrying on the brick kiln work. While so, in the year 1987, the State proposed to acquire the lands of the petitioner and for constructing a water treatment plant. Accordingly, a notification under Section 4(1) of The Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short, "the Act") came to be issued by the 1st respondent. Further, according to the petitioner, despite his objections, the respondents proceeded to issue declaration under Section 6 of the Act in G.O.Ms.No.884, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 10.09.1987. This was challenged by the petitioner in W.P.No.6385 of 1992 before this court and this court by order dated 20.09.2001 allowed the writ petition. However, as the lands were still required, the respondents have once again initiated acquisition proceedings and had issued a notification under Section 4(1) of the Act, in G.O.Ms.No.316, dated 10.09.2004, thereby invoking the emergency provision under Section 17(4) of the Act. Subsequently, the respondents have also issued a declaration under Section 6 of the Act in G.O.Ms.No.325, Municipal Administration and Water Supply (Metro Water), 5th October, 2004. Since the respondents had invoked the provision of Section 17(4) of the Act, an enquiry as contemplated under Section 5-A of the Act has been dispensed with.

3. Further, according to the petitioner, among the lands which were sought to be acquired, the land in S.No.136/1 measuring an extent of Acre 5.25 Cents was not a dry land as projected by the respondents and it has been declared as 'Nanja' by the revenue authorities and he has been doing agricultural operation in the same. Further, according to the petitioner, he has been carrying on the business of brick klin in the lands comprised in the other survey numbers and the government has also permitted him to quarry savudu earth and he has also purchased savudu and clay worth about Rs.40 lakhs and stocked the same for the purpose of his brick klin business. There was no real urgency in invoking the emergency provision under Section 17(4) of the Act and the emergency provisions has been misused by the respondent and the respondents have not at all applied their mind before invoking the emergency clause. That apart, when there are several vacant lands available in the locality, the respondents were biased against him and they had left out the immediate adjacent land lying on the east comprised in S.No.136/1 measuring about 4 Acres belonging to one Mr.A.C.Shanmugam and the land lying immediate west comprised in S.No.135 measuring about 14 Acres belonging to one Mr.Veeramani of Myalapore. Therefore, challenging the validity of the notification and the declaration issued for the acquisition of the land of the petitioner, he is before this court with the present writ petition.

4. The 1st respondent filed his counter affidavit for himself and on behalf of the other respondents, wherein inter alia contended that originally the acquisition proceedings was initiated in the year 1987 to acquire the lands for a public purpose to wit for the construction of water treatment plant by Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board at Chembarambakkam in Poonamallee Taluk and a notification under Section 4(1) of the Act was issued on 10.09.1987, thereafter, a declaration under Section 6 of the Act was also published on 23.05.1990. The above said notifications were challenged by the petitioner by way of writ petition in W.P.No.6385 of 1992, alleging certain technical flaws and this court by order dated 20.09.2001, allowed the above said writ petition and quashed the entire acquisition proceedings, however, the respondents were permitted to proceed afresh to acquire if the lands were required. Further, according to the 1st respondent, pursuant to the order of this court, after necessary getting necessary administrative sanctions to acquire the lands in question under emergency provisions of the Act, a proposal was submitted to the District Collector, Tiruvallur on 27.08.2003. Thereafter, a notification under section 4(1) of the Act was published on 09.09.2004 and subsequently, a declaration under Section 6 of the Act was also published on 05.10.2004.

5. The respondents admitted that the petitioner was cultivating his land in S.No.136/1 and in the remaining lands he was carrying on brick klin business where around 100 loads of savudu and clay were found stocked by the petitioner. The lands of the petitioner were sought to be acquired only for the purpose of laying water pipe lines so as to connect them to the water treatment plant.

6. So far as the allegation of the petitioner that he has been singled out in the adjacent lands were not acquired is concerned, according to the respondents, the lands belonging to one Mr.A.C.Shanmugam were also proposed to be acquired, but, he had obtained an order of stay from this court in W.P.No.10352 of 1999 on 18.06.1999. Insofar as the allegation, that the lands belonging to one Mr.Veerasingam and M/s.GEM Granites Co were not acquired, is concerned, according to the respondents, the lands belonged them were also acquired and the writ petitions filed by them got dismissed by this court. Thereafter, the request made by the other land owner namely M/s.Gems Granites for exemption of their lands was also rejected by the Government.

7. The 1st respondent further contended that as the water treatment plant work under Krishna Water Scheme has to be completed in a short period of one year, the lands in question were sought to be acquired invoking the emergency provisions in the Act. The lands belonged to the petitioner were very much nearer to the water treatment plant and besides laying of pipelines, the lands in question are going to be put in use for future metro water scheme. The lands of the petitioner were essentially required for laying pipes connecting to the main water treatment plant. There is no possibility in diverting the pipelines to other adjacent areas since the lands of the petitioner is very much nearer to the water treatment plant and further apart from laying pipes the lands of the petitioner are essentially required for future use. If the lands of the petitioner are not acquired, the whole water transmission main unit work would be jeopardized and collapsed.

8. The 3rd respondent filed an affidavit stating that the adjacent land of the petitioner property were already acquired and possession had also been taken by the Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board (in short "the CMWSS") for future expansion of the water treatment plant and for the construction of 305 mld water treatment plant and for laying allied pipelines in order to supply water to the Tambaram Municipality, Poonamallee Municipality, Sriperumbudur and Peerankaranai, the lands in S.No.136/1-5.25 Acres; S.No.1362 - 6.41 Acres; S.No.137/3 - 0.20 Acres; and S.No.138/4B - 0.80 Acres totalling about 12.66 Acres of lands situate in Chembarambakkam Village, Poonamallee Taluk, Tiruvallur District

are required.

9. The petitioner filed a rejoinder affidavit stating that though the capacity of the water treatment plant was mentioned as 530 mld, only 150 mld of water is being stored. Even though in the Notification the purpose has been maintained as "construction of treatment plant", in the counter affidavit, it has been mentioned as if the land is required for laying pipeline which is totally different from the purpose originally intended under the notification. That apart, even though the acquisition proceedings were initiated long ago, the petitioner has been in possession of the lands in questions and so far no compensation amount has paid to him and therefore, in view of the provisions in Section 24(2) of The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as "Act 30 of 2013"), he is entitled to the reliefs as prayed for in the writ petition.

10. The learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that absolutely there is no justification on the part of the respondent to invoke the emergency provision under Section 17(4) of the Act. The petitioner is an agriculturist and he has been doing agricultural operations and also doing brick klin business in the lands in question and he has been deprived of his right to carry on business without being given an opportunity of hearing, which is in violative of fundamental rights guaranteed under The Constitution of India.

11. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that even though acquisition proceedings were initiated as early as in the year 1987, till date, the possession of the lands have been with the petitioner and that no compensation amount has been paid to him and therefore, he is entitled to the benefits of the provisions under Section 24(2) of the Act 30 of 2013. She further added that the authorities without applying their mind to the relevant factors had mechanically invoked the emergency provisions under Section 17(4) of the Act and had acquired the land. On this score also the impugned acquisition proceedings is liable to be quashed in its entirety.

12. The learned counsel for the petitioner in support of her contention placed reliance on the following judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as this court:-

- (1) Periathambi Mudaliar v. Special Tahsildar (LA), Planning Scheme, Coimbatore - CDJ 1964 MHC 203 : AIR 1965 (Mad) 328;
- (2) Anand Sing v. State of Uttar Pradesh - (2010) 11 SCC 242 ;
- (3) Radhy Shyam (Dead) through LRs v.

State of Uttar Pradesh - (2011) 5 SCC 553;
(4) Ram Dhari Jindal Memorial Trust v.
Union of India - (2012) 11 SCC 370;
(5) Laxmi Lal (dead) through LRs v.
State of Rajasthan - (2013) 3 SCC 764;
(6) Laxmi Devi v. State of Bihar -
(2015) 10 SCC 241

13. Per contra, the learned Special Government Pleader submitted that the lands of the petitioners are now required for the water treatment plant which is essential and important for treating drinking water to be supplied to the residents in the City of Chennai. Even though the lands of the petitioners were acquired long ago, the earlier round of acquisition proceedings were quashed by this court on a technical ground, however, at that time of quashing the acquisition proceedings, liberty was given to the respondents to proceed with the acquisition proceedings afresh, if so required. Since the project was to be completed within a period one year under Krishna Water Scheme, after having considered the relevant factors and after having satisfied themselves that there was real urgency to acquire the lands, the authorities had proceeded to acquire the land by invoking the emergency provisions in Section 17(4) of the Act and accordingly issued the Notification under Section 4(1) of the Act.

14. I have considered the rival submissions and also perused the records carefully.

15. The power of eminent domain to acquire any land under the provisions of the Act is by now well recognized. Equally relevant is the right of the owners of the land by virtue of Article 300-A of the Constitution of India, that they shall not be deprived of their land except by the authority of law such as the procedures contemplated under the Act. One of the valuable rights for the owners is to raise objections to the notification issued under Section 4(1) of the Act opposing the acquisition on justifiable grounds. It is a general rule that before a declaration under Section 6 is made, enquiry under Section 5-A must be held. Conducting an enquiry under Section 5-A of the Act and considering the objection of the land owners for the acquisition proceedings is not empty formality and it is a substantive right which cannot be taken away, but for good and valid reasons. However, the said right to raise objections under Section 5-A is not absolute in all cases, as under Section 17 of the Act, there are certain exceptions to Section 5-A of the Act, which read as follows:

17. Special powers in cases of urgency.- (1)
In cases of urgency, whenever the appropriate
Government so directs, the Collector, though no

such award has been made, may, on the expiration of fifteen days from the publication of the notice mentioned in section 9, sub-section (1), take possession of any land needed for public purpose. Such land shall thereupon vest absolutely in the Government free from all encumbrances.

(2) Whenever, owing to any sudden change in the channel of any navigable river or other unforeseen emergency, it becomes necessary for any Railway Administration to acquire the immediate possession of any land for the maintenance of their traffic or for the purpose of making thereon a river-side or ghat station, or of providing convenient connection with or access to any such station, or the appropriate Government considers it necessary to acquire the immediate possession of any land for the purpose of maintaining any structure or system pertaining to irrigation, water supply, drainage, road communication or electricity, the Collector may, immediately after the publication of the notice mentioned in sub-section (1) and with the previous sanction of the appropriate Government, enter upon and take possession of such land, which shall thereupon vest absolutely in the Government free from all encumbrances:

Provided that the Collector shall not take possession of any building or part of a building under this sub-section without giving to the occupier thereof at least forty-eight hours' notice of his intention so to do, or such longer notice as may be reasonably sufficient to enable such occupier to remove his movable property from such building without unnecessary inconvenience.

(3) ... सत्यमेव जयते ...

(3-A)

(3-B)

(4) In the case of any land to which, in the opinion of the appropriate Government, the provisions of sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) are applicable, the appropriate Government may direct that the provisions of section 5-A shall not apply, and, if it does so direct, a declaration may be made under Section 6 in respect of the land at any time after the date of the publication of the notification under Section

4, sub-section (1)."

16. Thus, it is clear that whenever the Government invokes urgency clause under Section 17(1) or unforeseen emergency under Section 17(2) of the Act, it can dispense with the enquiry under Section 5-A of the Act by specifically invoking the provisions of Section 17(4), but, the only requirement is that the Government should apply their mind and satisfy themselves for the invocation of the urgency or unforeseen emergency clauses. The discretion of the Government to dispense with the enquiry under Section 5-A being statutory in nature, it should be exercised on reasonable grounds and there cannot be any arbitrariness. Further, it is also the settled law that invoking the emergency provision under Section 17(4) of the Act is the matter of subjective satisfaction of the Government and it is an administrative decision based on the materials available on record. Normally, it is not open to the court to make a scrutiny of the propriety of the satisfaction of the Government. However, when invocation of emergency provision is being challenged, the Government must produce appropriate materials to satisfy the court that the decision was taken after due application of mind and based on the materials available before the authorities. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Anand Singh v. State of Uttar Pradesh*, (2010) 11 SCC 242 has held as follows;

"43. The exceptional and extraordinary power of doing away with an enquiry under Section 5-A in a case where possession of the land is required urgently or in an unforeseen emergency is provided in Section 17 of the Act. Such power is not a routine power and save circumstances warranting immediate possession it should not be lightly invoked. The guideline is inbuilt in Section 17 itself for exercise of the exceptional power in dispensing with enquiry under Section 5-A. Exceptional the power, the more circumspect the Government must be in its exercise. The Government obviously, therefore, has to apply its mind before it dispenses with enquiry under Section 5-A on the aspect whether the urgency is of such a nature that justifies elimination of summary enquiry under Section 5-A. 44. A

repetition of the statutory phrase in the notification that the State Government is satisfied that the land specified in the notification is urgently needed and the provision contained in Section 5-A shall not apply, though may initially raise a

presumption in favour of the Government that prerequisite conditions for exercise of such power have been satisfied, but such presumption may be displaced by the circumstances themselves having no reasonable nexus with the purpose for which the power has been exercised. Upon challenge being made to the use of power under Section 17, the Government must produce appropriate material before the Court that the opinion for dispensing with the enquiry under Section 5-A has been formed by the Government after due application of mind on the material placed before it."

17. In another judgement in Radhy Shyam v. State of U.P., reported in 2011(5) SCC 533, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as follows:

"77. From the analysis of the relevant statutory provisions and interpretation thereof by this Court in different cases, the following principles can be culled out:

... ..
... ..

(v) Section 17(1) read with Section 17 (4) confers extraordinary power upon the State to acquire private property without complying with the mandate of Section 5-A. These provisions can be invoked only when the purpose of acquisition cannot brook the delay of even a few weeks or months. Therefore, before excluding the application of Section 5-A, the authority concerned must be fully satisfied that time of few weeks or months likely to be taken in conducting inquiry under Section 5-A will, in all probability, frustrate the public purpose for which land is proposed to be acquired.

(vi) The satisfaction of the Government on the issue of urgency is subjective but is a condition precedent to the exercise of power under Section 17(1) and the same can be challenged on the ground that the purpose for which the private property is sought to be acquired is not a public purpose at all or that the exercise of power is vitiated due to mala fides or that the authorities concerned did not apply their mind to the relevant factors and the records."

18. This court in *Periathambi Mudaliar v. Special Tahsildar (LA)*, Planning Scheme, Coimbatore reported in AIR 1965 (Mad) 328 has held as follows:-

"(3) The use of the emergency powers cannot be lightly resorted to and can be applied only in cases of real urgency, for their application would mean that the person whose land is acquired is deprived of a opportunity to make his representations in respect of the existence of public purpose or the need to acquire a particular land or to suggest an alternative land for acquisition. That is a valuable right of the owner. That right can only be deprived of for proper reasons. That does not mean that informing opinion the Collector or the Government are expected to give elaborate reasons. But there must be something on the record to show that the opinion of the Collector or the Government has been reasonably and fairly formed and neither arbitrarily or capriciously. As I said, this court will look to such material so as to satisfy itself as to the proper exercise of the power."

19. In the light of the principles laid down in the above judgements, this court has to see as to whether the opinion formed by the Government in the instant case to invoke the emergency provision based on a real urgency and it was not taken in an arbitrary manner. It is an admitted fact that originally the lands of the petitioner along with large extent of lands were sought to be acquired for the purpose of construction of water treatment plant by CMWSS and a notification under Section 4(1) of the Act was issued on 10.09.1987 and an enquiry under Section 5-A of the Act was conducted on 14.07.1987 and the petitioner had appeared for enquiry and submitted his objection. Thereafter, his objection were sent to the requisitioning body and after obtaining the opinion of the acquisition body, the over ruling the objections raised by the petitioner, declaration under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 23.05.1990. Challenging the above said notification, petitioner filed a writ petition in W.P.No.6385 of 1992 and the same was allowed by this court by order dated 20.09.2001 on the ground that there was delay of more than 1 year in publication of declaration under Section 6 of the Act from the last date of publication under Section 4(1) of the Act and there was also violation of Rule 3 (b) of the Land Acquisition Rules. However, the respondents were given liberty to proceed with afresh with the acquisition proceedings, if the land was still required.

20. Thereafter, as the lands were required for the water treatment plant, the Managing Director, CMWSS, forwarded a communications to the Government for acquiring the land in question invoking the urgency provision under the Act on 16.05.2002 and 19.05.2002. Thereafter, the Government considered the proposal and after obtaining the opinion from the Government Pleader, High Court of Madras and after perusing the entire materials permitted CMWSSB to acquired the land invoking the emergency provision and directed the CMWSSB to send necessary proposal to the Government through the 2nd respondent herein in G.O.(Ms) NO.128, Municipal Administration & Water Supply (Metro Water) Department dated 06.09.2002. Thereafter, a proposal was submitted by the Special Tahsildar (CMWSS) to the District Revenue Officer, Tiruvallur, who in turn after having considered the entire materials submitted his proposal for acquiring the lands invoking the emergency provisions of the Act to the Special Commissioner, Land Administration and the Special Commissioner, in turn, the Special Commissioner, after having considered the proposal submitted by the District Revenue Officer recommended to the Government to issue notification in the Government Gazette. Thereafter, notification under Section 4(1) of the Act on 10.09.2004, thereby dispensing with the enquiry under Section 5-A of the Act invoking the emergency provision in Section 17(4) of the Act. Immediately thereafter, notification under Section 6 of the Act was also published in the official gazette on 09.10.2004 in G.O.(Ms) No.325, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 05.10.2004.

21. From a careful perusal of the records it could be seen that the opinion to dispense with the enquiry under Section 5-A of the Act was formed by the authorities at all level after due application of mind. No doubt, it is the second round of acquisition. In the earlier round of acquisition proceedings, an enquiry under Section 5-A of the Act was conducted wherein the petitioner had participated and submitted his objections. The Government, after having considered the objections made by the petitioner, had over-ruled the objections and proceeded to issue declaration under Section 6 of the Act. But, the earlier acquisition proceedings had been set aside mainly on the ground that declaration under Section 6 of the Act was barred by limitation and the remarks of the requisitioning body was not communicated to the petitioner. Hence, there was violation of rule 3(b) of the Land Acquisition (Tamil Nadu) Rules. Since it was being procedural lapse, this court had given liberty to the respondents therein to initiate fresh proceedings.

22. The respondent filed a detailed counter affidavit explaining the reasons as to the circumstances under which they had decided to invoke the emergency provision of the Act to dispense with the enquiry under Section 5-A of the Act. The

acquisition is for construction of water treatment plant and the project was under Krishna Water Scheme and it had to be completed within a short period of one year. Hence, the authorities had decided to initiate the acquisition proceedings invoking the emergency provision of the Act as the petitioner's land were very much essential for laying water pipe lines connecting to water treatment plant. Thus, from a careful perusal of the records, this court is of the considered opinion that the Government had invoked the emergency provisions only after due application of mind and this court does not find any mala fide intention on the part of the governmental authorities.

23. So far as the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has been discriminated and the lands of his neighbors were deliberately left out from the acquisition proceedings is concerned, it has been stated in the counter affidavit that the neighboring lands belonged to one Mr.A.C.Shanmugham were also acquired and the writ petition filed by him was pending. Similarly, the lands belonged to one M/s.Gem Granites were also acquired and the writ petition filed by them challenging the acquisition proceedings came to be dismissed. Thereafter, the application filed by M/s.Gem Granites seeking to exempt their lands from the acquisition was considered and rejected by the Government. The writ petitions filed by M/s.Gem Granites and M/s.Imperial Granites Private Limited seeking re-conveyance of land got dismissed by this court and the same were confirmed by a Division Bench of this court by order dated 13.12.2017 in W.A.Nos.1900 and 1901 of 2010. Under such circumstances, the contention of the petitioner cannot be countenanced.

24. Even though the petitioner filed an additional affidavit at the time of hearing asserting his right under Section 24(2) of The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and advanced arguments, the petitioner has not taken any steps to amend the prayer suitably. Under such circumstances, the contention of the petitioner that he is entitled for the relief under Section 24(2) of the Act 30 of 2013 also cannot be considered in this writ petition.

25. Coming to the judgments relied on by the learned counsel for the petitioner, they were the cases where the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the valuable right of the land owners which has been protected under Article 300-A of The Constitution of India cannot be deprived except under due process of law and before invoking the emergency provision under Section 17(4) of the Act, the authorities should apply their mind and take a decision objectively. But, in the instant case, as already concluded hereinabove, the respondents after considering the materials and due application of mind had taken the decision to acquire the land by dispensing with the enquiry under Section 5-

A of the Act. Thus, the judgement relied on by the petitioner are not applicable to the facts of the present case.

26. In view of the foregoing discussions, this court hold that the writ petition is devoid of merits and the same deserves only to be dismissed.

27. In the result, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected WMP is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar

//True copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kmk
To

- 1.The Special Commissioner & Secretary to Government
(Municipal Administration & Water Supply Department),
Fort. St. George, Chennai 600 009.
 - 2.The District Collector, Tiruvallur District.
 - 3.The Executive Engineer, Madras Metropolitan Water Supply &
No.1, Pumping Station Road, Chintadripet, Chennai 600002.
 - 4.The Special Tahsildar, (Land Acquisition), No.1, Pumping
Station Road, Chintadripet, Chennai 600002.
- +1cc to Mrs.C.R.Rukmani, Advocate SR.No.80575
+1cc to Mr.N.Ramesh, Advocate SR.No.80288
+1cc to Government Pleader SR.No.80463

सत्यमेव जयते W.P.No.32285 of 2004

KJI (CO)

GMV (05/12/2018)

WEB COPY