

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 01.03.2018

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S.MANIKUMAR

AND

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE V.BHAVANI SUBBAROYAN

W.P.No.4621 of 2018

and

WMP Nos.5696 & 5697 of 2018

B.Navakumar

... Petitioner

vs.

1. IDBI Bank Ltd.,
rep. by its Authorized Officer,
Mr.Shiju Varghese,
Rohini City Square, Ground Floor,
Door No.57-A, Salai Road, Trichy - 620 018.

2. IDBI Bank Ltd.,
rep. by its Authorized Officer,
Mr.V.Venkatakrisnan,
RBG-Regional Office,
No.37, P.M.Towers, Greams Road,
Chennai - 600 006.

3. SIDBI
No.99, 1st Floor, Ambalathadayar Madam Street,
Puducherry - 605 001.

4. The District Collector - cum-
District Magistrate, Puducherry.

5. Deputy General Manager,
NPA Management Group,
IDBI Bank, No.115, Anna Salai,
PB.No.805, Saidapet,
Chennai - 600 015

... Respondents

WRIT Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a writ of certiorarified mandamus, calling for the records on the file of the 4th

respondent in order in Ref.No.233/DRDM/C3SARFAESI/2017 dated 09.02.2018 and quash the same and consequently direct the respondent 1 & 2 to partially release the secured asset and provide sufficient time to dispose the same to comply the amount as accepted by letter Ref.No.IDBI/NMG/BNK/2017-18/1415 dated 21.02.2018 by the 5th respondent.

For Petitioner : Mrs. Thilakavathy, Sr. Counsel
for Mr.C.Kulanthaivel
For Respondents: Mr.J.Kumaran (For R4)
Govt. Advocate (Pondy)

ORDER

(Order of the Court was delivered by S.MANIKUMAR, J)

Navakumar, petitioner herein / borrower has challenged the order made in proceedings No.233/DRDM/C.3/SARFAESI/2017 dated 09.02.2018 of the District Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Puducherry,. Order impugned is as follows:

"ORDER

Whereas, the Authorised officer, IDBI, Puducherry had filed an application under section 14 of the Securitisation and Reconstruction of Financial Assets and Enforcement of Security interest Act, 2002 (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act' against 1) M/s.BNK Modern Rice Mill Pvt Ltd. 2) M/s.Jayalakshmi Modern Rice Mill, 3) M/s.Padmavathi Naveena Arisi Aalai, 4) M/s.Sri. Venkatachalapathy Modern Rice Mill and 5) M/s.Sri Venkatachalapathy Stores (hereinafter referred as M/s.BNK Groups).

And Whereas, M/s.BNK Groups are stated to have availed various types of loan facilities to a tune of Rs.12,25,11,000/- from IDBI Bank, Puducherry Branch and for the due repayment of credit facility availed, they had created security interests over their assets the details of which is mentioned in the Schedule.

And Whereas, on account of default committed by the borrower in payment of interest and principal amounts payable to the Bank, the account of the borrower had been classified as non-performing asset on 31/03/2012 and demand notice under Section 13(2) of the Act dated 31/05/2016 had been served to the borrower.

And whereas, on the failure of the borrower to clear the dues even after expiry of 60 days, the Authorised Officer had taken constructive possession of the secured property and Possession taken notice under Section 13(4) was published in "Daily Thanthi" (Tamil) and "The New Indian Express" (English) News papers on

18/12/2016 as per rule 8 of the Security Interest Enforcement Rules, 2002.

And whereas, the aggregate amount of financial assistance granted and the claim of the bank falling due as on 01/05/2016 is Rs.18,61,82,206/- (Rupees Eighteen Crore Sixty One Lakh Two Thousand Two Hundred and Six Only) plus interest levied thereon.

And whereas, the Authorised Officer, IDBI Bank, Puducherry Branch has prayed for orders and directions to take possession and control of the secured assets and hand it over to the applicant as provided under Section 14 of the Act;

Now, therefore, I, Dr.Satyendra Singh Dursawat, District Magistrate, Puducherry after being satisfied that there is sufficient reason to invoke the provisions of section 14 of the Act do hereby direct the Deputy Collector (Revenue) North-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate to take possession of the Schedule mentioned property and handover the said property to the Authorised Officer, IDBI Bank, Puducherry Branch or his authorised representative within 15 days from the date of issue of this order. The Deputy Collector (Revenue) North-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate shall take necessary civil and police help for taking possession of the property."

2. Assailing the correctness of the abovesaid order, Ms.Thilakavathi, learned senior counsel for the petitioner submitted that on 14.12.2016, bank issued, possession notice under Section 13(4) of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 r/w Rule 8(1) of the Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules, 2002. Being aggrieved, petitioner has filed S.A.No.69 of 2017, before the Debts Recovery Tribunal-III, Chennai, seeking for a prayer to set aside the possession notice. Subsequently, upon hearing the learned counsel for the parties, Debts Recovery Tribunal-III, Chennai, vide proceedings dated 13.06.2017, dismissed S.A.No.69 of 2017. While doing so, Debts Recovery Tribunal-III, Chennai, granted liberty to the applicant therein to approach the bank for an amicable settlement in terms of the undertaking including the settlement proposal forwarded on 26.04.2017. Bank has been directed to consider the proposal and send reply within a period of two weeks, from the date of passing of the order in S.A.No.69 of 2017 dated 13.06.2017 on the file of Debts Recovery Tribunal-III, Chennai, so as to enable the applicant / writ petitioner to settle the matter amicably.

3. According to the learned senior counsel for the petitioner, order in S.A.No.69 of 2017 was received on 16.06.2017. By that time, bank had already initiated proceedings under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002, seeking

assistance from the District Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Puducherry, for taking physical possession of the property mortgaged.

4. Inviting the attention of this Court to the order made in W.P.No.2043 of 2018, learned senior counsel for the petitioner submitted that application under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 has been filed on 05.01.2017 and that the petitioner along with others were served with a notice dated 14.06.2017 under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002. It is the contention of the learned senior counsel that though, Debts Recovery Tribunal-III, Chennai, directed the bank to consider the settlement proposal forwarded on 26.04.2017, the same had been rejected by the bank vide letter dated 20.06.2017.

5. However, with due reference to the notice dated 14.06.2017, issued by the District Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Puducherry, writ petitioner has filed an affidavit dated 21.06.2017. A second notice dated 28.06.2017 was issued by the Office of the District Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Puducherry, directing the petitioner to appear either in person or by a duly authorised agent, with all legally admissible documents. Pending disposal of the application under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 another proposal dated 29.11.2017, has been sent by BNK Group of Industries to the Deputy General Manager, Recovery Department, IDBI Bank, Mumbai.

6. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submitted that without disclosing the fresh OTS proposal sent on 29.11.2017, bank has filed W.P.No.2043 of 2018, for a mandamus, to dispose of the application dated 05.01.2017, filed under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002, without impleading the petitioner and others. On 01.02.2018, Bank has obtained an order for disposal of the said application dated 05.01.2017.

7. Inviting the attention of this Court to the parameters set out in Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 and provisos 1 and 2, to the said Section, Ms.Thilakavathy, learned senior counsel for the petitioner submitted that as per the first proviso to Section 14 of SARFAESI Act, 2002, on receipt of an affidavit from the authorised officer, the District Magistrate or the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, as the case may be, shall after satisfying the contents of the affidavit pass suitable orders for the purpose of taking possession of the secured assets within a period of 30 days from the date of application. According to the learned senior counsel for the petitioner that as per the 2nd proviso to Section 14 of the SARFAESI 2002, if no order is passed by the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or the District Magistrate, as the case

may be, within the said period of 30 days, for the reasons beyond his control, he has to record reasons in writing for the same and then only can pass orders within such extended period, not exceeding in aggregate 60 days.

8. Inviting the attention of this Court to the date of filing of applications under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 i.e. 05.01.2017, the date of filing of W.P.No.2043 of 2018 and the date on which it was disposed of i.e. 01.02.2018, with directions, the time limit provided under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 learned senior counsel submitted that the time limit had already expired and therefore, remedy under Section 14 of the Act is not available to the bank.

9. According to the learned senior counsel for the petitioner that if bank had persuaded the application dated 05.01.2017, within the time provided therefor, under the provisions to Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002, then, the petitioner cannot have grievance. But when the bank had approached this Court, beyond the statutory period provided for, by taking an order under Section 14 of the Act, Bank cannot take advantage of the order made in W.P.No.2043 of 2018 dated 01.02.2018.

10. It is also the contention of the learned senior counsel for the petitioner that District Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Puducherry, has failed to consider the parameters set out in Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002. Learned senior counsel submitted that subsequently, the bank has forwarded OTS proposal, vide letter dated 21.02.2018 and in the abovesaid circumstances, the order made in Proceedings No.233/DRDM/C.3/SARFAESI/2017 dated 09.02.2018 under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002, requires interference.

11. Heard Ms.Thilakavathy, learned senior counsel for the petitioner and perused the materials available on record.

12. As per the averments made in the supporting affidavit to W.P.No.2043 of 2018, bank has filed an application dated 05.01.2017 under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 before the District Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Puducherry, seeking assistance for taking actual physical possession.

13. Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 mandates that on receipt of an affidavit from the Authorised Officer, the District Magistrate or the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, as the case may be, shall after satisfying the contents of the affidavit, pass suitable orders for the purpose of taking possession of the secured assets, within a period of 30 days from the date of application. Proviso to the said Section states

that if no order is passed by the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or District Magistrate, within the said period of thirty days, for the reasons beyond his control, he may after recording reasons, in writing, for the same, pass the order within such also period but not exceeding in aggregate 60 days.

14. Material on record discloses that though, SA No.69 of 2017, on the file of DRT-II, Chennai has been dismissed with a liberty to the applicant / writ petitioner to approach the respondent bank for amicable settlement in terms of the undertaking including the settlement proposal forwarded on 26.04.2017, bank has rejected the proposal on 20.06.2017, which is extracted hereunder.

"Please refer your letter, dated April 26, 2017 (received on May 18, 2017) requesting us to consider your proposal envisaging a total payment of Rs.1020 lakh to IDBI Bank towards the settlement of dues in respect of loan accounts of (i) Sri Venkatachalapathy Modern Rice Mill (ii) BNK Modern Rice Mill (iii) Sri Padmavathy Naveena Asiri Aalai (iv) Sri Venkatachalapathy Stores and (v) Jayalakshmi Modern Rice Mill.

In this connection, we would like to advise you that your proposal has been carefully examined by the Bank and the same has not been found acceptable.

Kindly acknowledge."

15. When bank has issued symbolic possession notice dated 14.12.2016, under Section 13(4) of the SARFAESI Act, 2002, r/w. Rule 8 of Security Interest (Enforcement) Rules, 2002, simultaneously, bank has sought for assistance under Section 14 of the Act, to take physical possession of the mortgaged property.

16. As per Section 13(4) of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 in case, the borrower fails to discharge his liability in full, within a period prescribed in Sub Section 2, the secured creditor may take recourse to one or more of the following measures to recover his secured debt, namely:--

(a) take possession of the secured assets of the borrower including the right to transfer by way of lease, assignment or sale for realising the secured asset;

(b) take over the management of the business of the borrower including the right to transfer by way of lease, assignment or sale for realising the secured asset:

PROVIDED that the right to transfer by way of lease, assignment or sale shall be exercised only where the substantial part of the business of the borrower is held as security for the debt:

PROVIDED FURTHER that where the management of whole of the business or part of the business is severable, the secured creditor shall take over the management of such business of the borrower which is relatable to the security for the debt.

(c) appoint any person (hereafter referred to as the manager), to manage the secured assets the possession of which has been taken over by the secured creditor;

(d) require at any time by notice in writing, any person who has acquired any of the secured assets from the borrower and from whom any money is due or may become due to the borrower, to pay the secured creditor, so much of the money as is sufficient to pay the secured debt.

17. Taking symbolic possession of the property mortgaged with the bank and seeking assistance, for taking actual physical possession, both, would fall within the measures envisaged in Section 13(4) of the SARFAESI Act, 2002. Seeking assistance for taking physical possession of the mortgaged property, is also integral, to take possession of the secured asset of the borrower. Therefore, we are of the view that merely because, symbolic possession notice under Section 13(4) of the SARFAESI Act, 2002, has been issued, right of the bank to file an application under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, to seek assistance from the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or the District Collector-cum-District Magistrate, cannot be restricted.

18. Contention of the learned senior counsel for the petitioner that when OTS proposals were under consideration, bank had approached the District Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Puducherry, under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 and that therefore, the same is erroneous, cannot be countenanced for the reason that bank had already filed application under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 on 05.01.2017, before the District Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Puducherry. SA No.69 of 2017, has been disposed of only on 13.06.2017. Later on As stated supra, on 20.06.2017, bank had declined the OTS proposal dated 26.04.2017. First proviso to Section 14 of the SARFAESI reads that provided further on receipt of an affidavit from the Authorised Officer, the District Magistrate or the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, as the case may be, shall after satisfying the contents of the affidavit, pass suitable orders for the purpose of taking possession of the secured assets, within a period of 30 days from the date of application.

19. As per the second proviso to Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002, that if no order is passed by the Chief Metropolitan Magistrate or District Magistrate, within the said period of thirty days, for the reasons beyond his control, he may after recording reasons, in writing, for the same, pass the order within such also period but not exceeding in aggregate 60 days.

20. As per Section 17(1) of the SARFAESI Act, 2002, Any person (including borrower), aggrieved by any of the measures referred to in sub-section (4) of section 13 taken by the secured creditor or his authorised officer under this Chapter, may make an application alongwith such fee, as may be prescribed to the Debts Recovery Tribunal having jurisdiction in the matter within forty-five days from the date on which such measure had been taken: PROVIDED that different fees may be prescribed for making the application by the borrower and the person other than the borrower.

21. At this juncture, we also place on record the submission of the learned senior counsel that the petitioner is not seeking for review of the order made in W.P.No.2043 of 2018 dated 01.02.2018.

22. Though provisos to Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 set out different period, on both the occasions, District Magistrate cum District Collector or the learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate, as the case may be, has to satisfy not only the contents of the affidavit, but also the parameters set out in the said section. Contention that the period prescribed therefor, cannot exceed the aggregate 60 days, and that therefore, the impugned order under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002 is erroneous, depends upon as to how provision has to be read and understood, in the light of the statutory provisions of the SARFAESI Act, 2002, whether such provision is mandatory or obligatory? and whether, the provision has to be read as shall or may? Earlier we have recorded the submission of the learned senior counsel that the petitioner is not seeking for review of the order. But assails the correctness of the order by the District Collector Cum District Magistrate, Puducherry. Contentions raised before us, can always be urged before the Debts Recovery Tribunal, under Section 17 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002. We are not inclined to express any opinion, on the challenge, if any, to be made under Section 17 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002.

23. Finally, from the material on record, it could be deduced that in response to the letter dated 29.11.2017, requesting IDBI Bank, to accept Rs.1050 Lakhs as settlement amount, bank without prejudice to the rights, in principle, has

agreed for settlement of dues "OTS" subject to certain terms and conditions, mentioned in Annexure-I to the letter dated 21.02.2018, which is extracted.

1. Crystallised Amount : Rs.1175 Lakh

2. Payment Schedule :

a) Upfront amount of Rs.10 Lakh to be deposited in No Lien Account (since deposited)

b) Balance amount of Rs.1165 Lakh to be paid on or before March 31, 2018.

3. Payment of Interest :

On OTS amount, if any- Nil, if paid on or before March 31, 2018"

24. Bank has come out with a OTS as extracted supra. It is for the bank to consider as to whether order under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, 2002, has to be enforced or not.

25. Though, Ms.Thilakavathy, learned senior counsel seeks leave to file an appeal against the order in W.P.No.2043 of 2018 dated 01.02.2018, on the facts and circumstances of this Court, we decline to grant the same.

26. When there is an effective and alternative remedy, writ petition is not entertained and that the same is dismissed. For the above conclusion stated supra, we also take the support of the following judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Court.

(i) In Precision Fastenings v. State Bank of Mysore, reported in 2010(2) LW 86, this Court held as follows:

"This Court has repeatedly held in a number of decisions right from the decision in Division Electronics Ltd. v. Indian Bank (DB) Markandey Katju, C.J., (2005 (3) C.T.C., 513), that the remedy of the aggrieved party as against the notice issued under Section 13(4) of SARFAESI Act is to approach the appropriate Tribunal and the writ petition is not maintainable. The same position has been succinctly stated by the Hon'ble the Supreme Court in Transcore v. Union Of India (2006 (5) C.T.C. 753) in paragraph No. 26 wherein the Supreme Court has held as under:

—

"The Tribunal under the DRT Act is also the Tribunal under the NPA Act. Under Section 19 of the DRT Act read with Rule 7 of the Debts Recovery Tribunal (Procedure) Rules, 1993 (1993 Rules), the applicant bank or FI has to pay fees for filing such

application to DRT under the DRT Act and, similarly, a borrower, aggrieved by an action under Section 13(4) of NPA Act was entitled to prefer an Application to the DRT under Section 17 of NPA." (Emphasis added) "

(ii) In Union Bank of India v. Satyawati Tondon, reported in 2010 (5) LW 193 (SC), the Hon'ble Apex Court has held as follows:

"16. The facts of the present case show that even after receipt of notices under Section 13(2) and (4) and order passed under Section 14 of the SARFAESI Act, respondent Nos. 1 and 2 did not bother to pay the outstanding dues. Only a paltry amount of Rs. 50,000/- was paid by respondent No. 1 on 29.10.2007. She did give an undertaking to pay the balance amount in installments but did not honour her commitment. Therefore, the action taken by the appellant for recovery of its dues by issuing notices under Section 13(2) and 13(4) and by filing an application under Section 14 cannot be faulted on any legally permissible ground and, in our view, the Division Bench of the High Court committed serious error by entertaining the writ petition of respondent No. 1.

17. There is another reason why the impugned order should be set aside. If respondent No. 1 had any tangible grievance against the notice issued under Section 13(4) or action taken under Section 14, then she could have availed remedy by filing an application under Section 17(1). The expression 'any person' used in Section 17(1) is of wide import. It takes within its fold, not only the borrower but also guarantor or any other person who may be affected by the action taken under Section 13(4) or Section 14. Both, the Tribunal and the Appellate Tribunal are empowered to pass interim orders under Sections 17 and 18 and are required to decide the matters within a fixed time schedule. It is thus evident that the remedies available to an aggrieved person under the SARFAESI Act are both expeditious and effective. Unfortunately, the High Court overlooked the settled law that the High Court will ordinarily not entertain a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution if an effective remedy is available to the aggrieved person and that this rule applies with greater rigour in matters involving recovery of taxes, cess, fees, other types of public money

and the dues of banks and other financial institutions. In our view, while dealing with the petitions involving challenge to the action taken for recovery of the public dues, etc., the High Court must keep in mind that the legislations enacted by Parliament and State Legislatures for recovery of such dues are code unto themselves inasmuch as they not only contain comprehensive procedure for recovery of the dues but also envisage constitution of quasi judicial bodies for redressal of the grievance of any aggrieved person. Therefore, in all such cases, High Court must insist that before availing remedy under Article 226 of the Constitution, a person must exhaust the remedies available under the relevant statute.

18. While expressing the aforesaid view, we are conscious that the powers conferred upon the High Court under Article 226 of the Constitution to issue to any person or authority, including in appropriate cases, any Government, directions, orders or writs including the five prerogative writs for the enforcement of any of the rights conferred by Part III or for any other purpose are very wide and there is no express limitation on exercise of that power but, at the same time, we cannot be oblivious of the rules of self-imposed restraint evolved by this Court, which every High Court is bound to keep in view while exercising power under Article 226 of the Constitution. It is true that the rule of exhaustion of alternative remedy is a rule of discretion and not one of compulsion, but it is difficult to fathom any reason why the High Court should entertain a petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution and pass interim order ignoring the fact that the petitioner can avail effective alternative remedy by filing application, appeal, revision, etc. and the particular legislation contains a detailed mechanism for re-dressal of his grievance. It must be remembered that stay of an action initiated by the State and/or its agencies/instrumentalities for recovery of taxes, cess, fees, etc. seriously impedes execution of projects of public importance and disables them from discharging their constitutional and legal obligations towards the citizens. In cases relating to recovery of the dues of banks, financial institutions and secured creditors, stay

granted by the High Court would have serious adverse impact on the financial health of such bodies/institutions, which ultimately prove detrimental to the economy of the nation. Therefore, the High Court should be extremely careful and circumspect in exercising its discretion to grant stay in such matters. Of course, if the petitioner is able to show that its case falls within any of the exceptions carved out in Baburam Prakash Chandra Maheshwari v. Antarim Zila Parishad AIR 1969 SC 556, Whirlpool Corporation v. Registrar of Trade Marks, Mumbai (1998) 8 SCC 1=1999-2-L.W. 200 and Harbanslal Sahnia and another v. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. and others (2003) 2 SCC 107 and some other judgments, then the High Court may, after considering all the relevant parameters and public interest, pass appropriate interim order.

27. It is a matter of serious concern that despite repeated pronouncement of this Court, the High Courts continue to ignore the availability of statutory remedies under the DRT Act and SARFAESI Act and exercise jurisdiction under Article 226 for passing orders which have serious adverse impact on the right of banks and other financial institutions to recover their dues. We hope and trust that in future the High Courts will exercise their discretion in such matters with greater caution, care and circumspection.

28. Insofar as this case is concerned, we are convinced that the High Court was not at all justified in injuncting the appellant from taking action in furtherance of notice issued under Section 13(4) of the Act.

29. In the result, the appeal is allowed and the impugned order is set aside. Since the respondent has not appeared to contest the appeal, the costs are made easy."

(iii) In *Saraspathy Sundararaj v. Authorised Officer and Assistant General Manager, State Bank of India*, reported in (2010) 5 LW 560, the Court held as follows:

"The petitioner has filed this writ petition praying for a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records relating to the possession notice dated 16.09.2004 issued by the respondent under the SARFAESI Act and consequently direct the respondent to effect the settlement in accordance with the SBI OTS-SME 2010 Scheme as contained in

its letter dated 18.03.2010 and unconditionally restore physical possession of the six rooms taken physical possession by it at No. 29, Sarojini Street, T. Nagar, Chennai - 17 with such damages.

... When a specific forum has been created which enables the borrower to challenge the action of the financial institution by filing necessary petition under Section 17, the petitioner is not entitled to invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court. What could not be achieved by the petitioner by filing a petition before the appropriate Forum, which is at present barred by period of limitation, could not be permitted to be achieved by extending the jurisdiction conferred to this Court under Article 226 of The Constitution of India. Above all, since the petitioner has violated the terms and conditions of the loan by transferring the property in favour of her son, this Court is not inclined to entertain the petition.

..... "

27. In the result, the writ petition is dismissed. No Costs. Consequently, the connected Writ Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ars

To

1. The District Collector - cum-
District Magistrate,
Puducherry.

+1cc to Mr.C.MULANTHAIVEL Advocate, S.R.No. 15781

+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No. 16372

W.P.No.4621 of 2018

and

WMP Nos.5696 & 5697 of 2018

KAN(CO)

TR(16/03/2018)