

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 14.03.2018

Coram

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE M.VENUGOPAL
AND
THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE S.VAIDYANATHAN

W.P.No.34304 of 2017 and
W.M.P.Nos. 38175 of 2017 and 2181 of 2018

S.Kalyanasundaram .. Petitioner
Vs.

1. The Registrar
Tamilnadu Cooperative Societies
No.170, N.V.Natarajan Maaligai
Periyar EVR High Road Poonamallee
High Road, Kilpauk, Chennai - 600 010
2. The Deputy Registrar (Housing)
Chennai Zone,
Ramanathan Street, T.Nagar,
Chennai - 600 017
3. The Member Secretary
Chennai Metropolitan Development
Authority,
Thallamuthu Natarajan Building,
Egmore, Chennai 600 008
4. The Commissioner,
Corporation of Chennai
Rippon Building, Chennai - 3
5. The Zonal Officer (Zone-12)
Corporation of Chennai
No.1, New Street, Alandur-St.Thomas
Mount, Chennai - 600 016
6. The President,
Larsen & Toubro Employees Co-operative
House Building Society Limited,
Mount Poonamallee Road,
Manapakkam, Chennai - 89
7. St.Joseph's Matriculation Higher Secondary
School, rep. By its correspondent,
Seven Well Street,
Butt Road, Chennai - 16.

..Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents 3 to 5 to take immediate steps to stop the construction put up by the 7th Respondent in common property of the society comprised in S.Nos.75/7A and 75/7C measuring an extent of 46 cents at Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam lay-out based on the letter dated 17.11.2017 in Na.Ka.No.1859/2017/C of the 2nd Respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.Mariappan for Mr.N.Chinnaraj

For Respondents : Mr.L.P.Shanmugasundaram for R1 and R2
Special Government Pleader

Mr.C.Johnson for R3

Mr.K.Soundarrajan for R4 and R5

Mr.T.R.Rajagopalan, Sr.Counsel for
M/s K.S.Jeyaganeshan for R6

Mr.Perumbulavil Radhakrishnan for R7

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by M.VENUGOPAL, J.]

Heard the Learned Counsel for the Petitioner, the Learned Counsel appearing for the Respondents 1 to 5 and 7th Respondent and the Learned Senior Counsel for the 6th Respondent.

2. According to the Petitioner, Larsen and Toubro Employees Co-operative House Building Society Limited (6th Respondent) is registered under the Tamilnadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1983, bearing registration No.XNC-729 having its office at Mount Poonamallee Road, Manapakkam, Chennai - 89. He is the member of the 6th Respondent / Society having Membership No.371 and apart from him, there are more than 400 members in the Society. As a matter of fact, the Members of the Society owns Land allotted to them by the Society at Virugambakkam, Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam and the Society also owns certain lands in the developed plots, which are meant for common utilities like parks, shopping area, schools etc.,

3. The stand of the Petitioner is that the 6th Respondent / Society was established with a sole aim and purpose for promoting the economic interests of its members and to

facilitate the operation in accordance with the Co-operative Principles. The common road and common utilities such as Parks were gifted to the Local Panchayat and now, the Local Panchayat was merged with the Corporation of Chennai.

4. The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner points out that as per Article 5 of the Byelaws of the Society, persons, who are employed permanently in Larsen & Toubro Limited, Chennai and Engineering Construction Corporation Limited, Chennai alone are eligible to become a Member. Furthermore, as per Article 14(1) of the Byelaws of the Society, no member shall be permitted to withdraw any of the shares or to resign his membership from the Society within three years, unless he ceases to be an employee of Larsen & Toubro Limited, Chennai or Engineering Construction Corporation Limited, Chennai. In fact, the Engineering Construction Corporation Limited, subsequently, got amalgamated with Larsen and Toubro Limited on 07.04.1984 and any person to become a Member and continue to be a member in the Society, the main requisite is that the said employee shall be employed permanently in Larsen and Toubro Limited, Chennai.

5. The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner contends that the Society is presently run by the Board of Directors, in which 6 out of 7 Directors cease to be Members of the Society by virtue of the provisions of the Byelaws. The Byelaws of the Society specifies that the General Manager / Regional Manager of Larsen & Toubro Limited shall be ex-officio President of the Society and as per Article 27 of the Byelaws of the Society, the President of the Society shall be the First Member.

6. The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that Board of Directors of the Society had indulged in various Acts and Deeds, which are contrary to the Byelaws and Co-operative Societies Act. Indeed, the present President of the Society is neither employed presently with Larsen & Toubro Limited nor General Manager nor Regional Manager of Larsen & Toubro Limited to get selected for the post of President and likewise, the present Secretary was never employed with Larsen and Toubro. In this regard, there is a flagrant violation of the Byelaws and Provisions of the Act. Also that the five other Directors of the Society also cease to be Members of the Society and therefore, not qualified to hold the post of Director.

7. The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner brings it to the notice of this Court that the 6th Respondent / Society holds certain parcels of Lands at Virugambakkam, Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam, which is actually meant to be used for Common Utilities, Schools, Park etc., The functionaries of the Board, who are holding the respective posts in flagrant violation of the Byelaws and provisions, according to the Petitioner, had

illegally and unlawfully entered into a Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.03.2015 with two Associates viz., CRR Puram and L&T Colony, Manapakkam Owners Welfare Association and C.R.Ramakrishnapuram Common Welfare Association, Virugambakkam in and by which, the Welfare Associations were appointed as Administrators for Managing the common properties of the society situated in Virugambakkam and Manapakkam. Furthermore, the members of the said Association are also members of the society and other residents of Virugambakkam, Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam.

8. The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner takes a plea that the Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.03.2015 authorizes the Administrators to use the common property of the society and further, the Administrator is authorised to receive 80% of the consideration leaving only the balance 20% to the Society. The Administrator is an independent association and not an employee of the society and thus, the above act of the functionaries of the Board authorising the Administrators to use the common property of the Society and entering into the Memorandum of Understanding with them is deliberate violation of the Byelaws of the Society and the Act.

9. The version of the Petitioner is that by virtue of Memorandum of Understanding dated 27.03.2015, the Administrators had let out the common property of the Society comprised in S.Nos.75/7A and 75/7C measuring an extent of 46 cents at Mugalivakkam Village to the Management of the 7th Respondent for putting up a School in the common property in the Society. The 6th Respondent / Society have tried to alienate the property of the Society to the 7th Respondent through the aforesaid Associations formed by them through some vested interest and the same is an illegal, unlawful one and totally against the Byelaws of the Society.

10. The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner contends that the Board of Directors of the 6th Respondent / Society has no powers to form another Association and to deal with the property of the Society through such an Association. The acts and deeds committed by the Board of Directors represented by the President and Welfare Associations are totally against the interest of the Members of the Society and with a view to grab the common property of the Society, the 6th Respondent along with the so-called Association and 7th Respondent started constructing a pucca super structure in the common property of the society in Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam layout in the name of the School.

11. The Learned Counsel for the Petitioner refers to the complaint before the 1st Respondent dated 05.10.2017 submitted by the Petitioner and 123 members of the Society to enquire into

the issue and prevent the 7th Respondent from putting up further construction, as per the Byelaws of the Society and Societies Act. The 2nd Respondent based on the complaint dated 05.10.2017, on enquiry, communicated to the 7th Respondent by his letter dated 24.10.2017 to stop the construction in common property of the Society comprised in S.Nos.75/7A and 75/7C measuring an extent of 46 cents at Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam Layout and also by letter dated 17.11.2017, the 2nd Respondent directed the 3rd Respondent to take steps to stop the construction of the 7th Respondent. The letter of the 2nd Respondent dated 17.11.2017 was duly served in-person to the 3rd Respondent on 21.11.2017. The main grievance of the Petitioner is that even after the order of the 2nd Respondent, as stated supra, the 7th Respondent had not stopped the construction and yet continuing the same and that the 3rd Respondent had not taken steps to stop the construction made by the 7th Respondent. In this regard, the plea of the Petitioner is that the 3rd Respondent is duty bound to initiate suitable action against the 7th Respondent in regard to the construction of the School in common property of the society comprised in S.Nos.75/7A and 75/7C measuring an extent of 46 cents at Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam lay out. Since no action has been taken by the concerned authorities, the present Writ Petition is filed by the Petitioner before this Court seeking for passing an order in directing the Respondents 3 to 5 to take immediate steps to stop the construction put up by the 7th Respondent in common property in question in Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam layout based on the letter dated 17.11.2017 of the 2nd Respondent.

12. The 3rd Respondent / CMDA in its counter affidavit had averred that earlier, St. Joseph's Educational Trust represented by its Chief Trustee, Jansy Thomson had applied for planning permission for construction at Manapakkam, Mugalivakkam Village in Survey Nos.75/7A and 75/7C at Mugalivakkam Village within the limits of Greater Chennai Corporation. In fact, the planning permission application was examined and after careful examination on the ownership of the property, the planning permission was issued by the 3rd Respondent in Planning Permission No.C/9646/12-A&B/2017 in Letter No.C4/1001/2016 dated 03.03.2017.

13. Further, in the counter affidavit filed by the 3rd Respondent it is averred that the stand of the 2nd Respondent / CMDA is that it issued planning permission based on the ownership (patta) issued by the Revenue Department and also that it is the version of the CMDA that issuance of planning permission by it does not confer any ownership or title over the property. Prior to the issuance of planning permission for any development, the 3rd Respondent / C.M.D.A., verifies only the

aspect of applicant's right over the site under reference for development thereon, based on the copies of the documents (such as Sale Deed, patta, Lease Deed, Gift Deed etc., and GPA) furnished together with the application. In short, the 3rd Respondent primarily considers the prima facie aspect about the applicant's right over the property.

14. The 3rd Respondent in its counter also points out that any person, who acquires interest in the property shall ensure independently about the ownership and the applicant's right before acquiring the right or title over the property he/she/they shall have to prove before the competent Court of Law to decide on the ownership or get the matter settled in the Court of Law. Therefore, the 3rd Respondent is not the competent authority to decide the matter in issue.

15. The stand of the 5th Respondent is that the 6th Respondent had formed a lay out in the year 1989 and allotted the plots to its members and in the said lay out, a portion of the land in Survey Nos.75/7A and 75/7C was earmarked for constructing a school, later the 6th Respondent- Society leased out the said place to the 7th Respondent in the year 2013 for a period of 30 years . The said lease was duly approved by the General Body.

16. At this juncture, the Learned Standing Counsel for the 5th Respondent / Corporation of Chennai contends that the 7th Respondent, later, obtained planning permission on 03.03.2017 from the 3rd Respondent / CMDA for constructing school building and the building permission was granted by the Corporation on 22.05.2017 and thereafter, the 7th Respondent had commenced the construction. Furthermore, the members of the 6th Respondent made a complaint to the 1st Respondent under Section 73 of the Tamilnadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1983 about the numerous activities done by the Board including the leasing out of the land allotted for the school purpose to the 7th Respondent.

17. The Learned Counsel for the 5th Respondent brings it to the notice of this Court that the 5th Respondent had inspected the School building and found that there are violations in the side setback and the said report was forwarded to the 3rd Respondent on 23.11.2017 for taking appropriate action, since the planning permission was granted by the 3rd Respondent, at present, the construction work, according to the 5th Respondent, was stopped by the 7th Respondent.

18. The Learned Senior Counsel for the 6th Respondent forcefully contends that the Petitioner was a paid Secretary of the Society earlier, becoming a Member of the 6th Respondent / Society. According to the 6th Respondent / Society, there is no

flagrant violation of the Byelaws and the provision of the Act and all the persons elected and holding the post are very much in conscience with the Byelaws and the Tamilnadu Cooperative Society Act. In fact, the Petitioner has also retired from the Company on 01.07.2016, but, still continues to be Member of the 6th Respondent / Society.

19. The Learned Senior Counsel for the 6th Respondent draws the attention of this Court that the 6th Respondent / Society holds the Lands in Virugambakkam, Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam, as per Memorandum of Understanding entered on 27.03.2015 between the 6th Respondent / Society and one C.R.Ramakrishnapuram Welfare Association and C.R.Ramakrishnapuram and L&T Colony, Manapakkam Owners Welfare Association is neither illegal nor unlawful one. Furthermore, the lands in Virugambakkam were developed and the owners of the plots, who were the employees of the L&T Company has formed an association to administer the day to day affairs of the people, who have constructed the houses in Virugambakkam Land owned by the 6th Respondent / Society and the same wise in Manapakkam. The Members of the 6th Respondent / Society are also the Members of the Association in both the places for effective running and management of various commercial activities in both the schemes. Also the Employees-Members, on selling the plots the purchasers are also made as the members of the Association. The individual societies were formed and registered under the Tamilnadu Societies Act and there is no illegality or irregularity in entering into the Memorandum of Understanding in question between the 6th Respondent and other two associations, which are part of the 6th Respondent. As a matter of fact, the same was approved by the General Body of the Meeting of the Society held on 07.12.2014, in which, the Petitioner took part and supported the resolution to execute the Memorandum of Understanding between the 6th Respondent and other two associations and also affixed his signature in the Minutes of the Meeting.

20. The Learned Senior Counsel for the 6th Respondent contends that the 7th Respondent / St.Joseph Educational Trust was permitted to construct the school based on the Board Resolution dated 19.07.2013 and St.Joseph Educational Trust was permitted to construct the school in the property of the 6th Respondent, which was leased out to the Trust after participating in the General Body meeting and also supporting the Resolution to execute the lease in favour of St.Joseph Educational Trust to build the school.

21. The Learned Senior Counsel for the 6th Respondent adverts to Clause 37(4) of the Byelaw of the Society, which enjoins that Sell or Lease or otherwise deal with the sites, to members or others on such terms, as the Society may determine

and only after passing the Board's Resolution on 19.07.2013, a decision was taken to lease the Land for School and two associations were formed in the year 2000 and 2009 much earlier than the Board of the 6th Respondent / Society assuming charge and therefore, it is false to aver that the Board of Directors of 6th Respondent / Society had formed another association, which are against the interest of the Members of the Society.

22. The Learned Counsel for the 6th Respondent contends that when all the 123 Members, except the Petitioner were admitted to the 6th Respondent on 16.05.2016 as new members, the new members are neither connected nor affected by the earlier housing schemes of the 6th Respondent. The purported letter of the 2nd Respondent dated 17.11.2017 was received by the 6th Respondent only on 12.01.2018 and the 6th Respondent / Society had not indulged in any construction activities. In fact, the 6th Respondent had only 'Leased' out the Land to the 7th Respondent for construction of the School in the allotted area and the same is taken in respect of the welfare of the members of the Society.

23. It comes to be known that the 6th Respondent had addressed a communication to the 2nd Respondent on 19.10.2017 (with reference to the surprise inspection on 11.10.2017) and further that the 2nd Respondent had issued a notice requiring 6th Respondent to stop the construction immediately and the 6th Respondent responded to the 2nd Respondent by means of a communication dated 01.12.2017 requiring the 2nd Respondent to furnish a copy of the petition dated 05.10.2017 made by some members and also communicated that the copy of the complaint is not attached along with the letter and requested the 2nd Respondent to serve copy of the petition, however, the 2nd Respondent had neither responded to the letter of the 6th Respondent / Society, in this regard, nor he furnished a copy of the Petition to the Society till date.

24. The Learned Senior Counsel for the 6th Respondent / Society lastly submitted that the Land was lying unutilised for more than 25 years and it was used as a public toilet causing health hazard to the local community, besides the same was used by unscrupulous elements and also, the Registrar Housing in this Writ Petition is an necessary party to the proceeding and the Writ Petition is liable to be dismissed for non-joinder of necessary parties.

25. The 6th Respondent / Society in its additional counter had averred that Writ Petition is not maintainable, since the averment in the Writ Petition unerringly had pointed out only the internal affairs between the Petitioner-Member of the Society and the 6th Respondent / Society. The 6th Respondent / Society being a private Society, is not receiving any funds from

the Government and as such, for redressal of his grievances, if any, he should only approach the competent Civil Court and instead of approaching the competent Civil Court, filed Writ Petition, which is not maintainable in Law.

26. In the additional counter of the 6th Respondent, the stand is taken by the Society that the Petitioner in the Writ Affidavit had not made any averment in regard to the violation of construction and other violations and as such, the Writ Petition is not maintainable before this Court. When the Lease of the land allotted for the school purpose to the 7th Respondent is a genuine and valid one, then, it is not open to the Petitioner to say anything contra about it.

27. The Learned Counsel for the 7th Respondent submits that the St. Joseph's Educational Trust was registered in the year 1985 with the objectives of rendering educational services to the public, especially, the children from Marginalized families. It cannot be gainsaid that the Trust runs one Higher secondary School in their registered Office premises with 750 children and also one primary school at Poonamallee with 350 children. Also they impart education to the children from lower middle class and marginalised families.

28. The Learned Counsel for the 7th Respondent submits that to enlarge the educational activities in the nearby Manapakkam area, which is thickly populated one where there is no other State Board Higher Secondary School, the Trust had decided to have a new school with State Syllabus, as per Tamilnadu Government Guidelines and approached Larson & Toubro Employees Co-operative House Building Society Limited for their eight grounds of land at S.Nos.75/7A and 75/7C at Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam Lay out, which was purchased by them. The said lands comprising of eight grounds was exclusively earmarked for school purposes in the Lay Out dated 19.07.2013 to serve the 6th Respondent families, other members of the locality including the L& T Welfare Association Members and also other citizens of Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam area. In this connection, the Learned Counsel for the 7th Respondent brings it to the notice of this Court that the 6th Respondent Society gave the Land in question on a 33 year Lease through Resolution dated 19.07.2013 by their Board and later, on 07.12.2014 in their General Body of the Housing Society. This resolution was supported by 26 members out of 30 members of the Society. Consequently, the Petitioner was one among 26 members, who supported the resolution. The Lease Deed in question was registered on 11.09.2013 vide document No.12582/13 on the file of SRO, Kundrathur.

29. The main plea taken on behalf of the 7th Respondent / School is that they approached the 3rd Respondent / CMDA and

obtained building approval vide their Sanction No.C/9646/12A&B/2017 after fulfilling all the legitimate conditions. After securing approval from the 3rd and 4th Respondents, the 7th Respondent had put up construction in March 2017 and they had completed up to 2nd Floor and only other miscellaneous work is under progress to start the school during the Academic Year, March 2018 after complying with all the norms of CMDA. Further, the Education Department had informed that the Recognition Process also has been initiated and for the admission during the year 2018, Academic Studies had been initiated and under progress. Also application forms were furnished and in short, the admission is under progress.

30. The Learned Counsel for the 7th Respondent points out that while resolution was pressed for voting, only 4 members had voted against the resolution and other 26 members voted in favour of the resolution. At the risk of repetition, this Court contends that the Petitioner is one among 26 members, who supported the resolution, after three years supporting the resolution, the Petitioner, has now come to this Court without raising the issue in the 6th Respondent Housing Society, as per Society Byelaws 26(1) and also not applied for Arbitration before the 1st Respondent's office.

31. The Learned Counsel for the 7th Respondent takes a stand that from the year 2013-2017 regularly 'Regulatory Inspections of All Society Documents and Audit' was carried out in respect of the working of the 6th Respondent by the 2nd Respondent and the audit reports are clear and there was no objection raised by the 2nd Respondent / Deputy Registrar (Housing), Chennai Zone, only with malafide intention, the 2nd Respondent had issued a letter dated 17.11.2017 objecting to the school construction.

32. The Learned Counsel for the 7th Respondent takes a plea that the Petitioner had not availed remedial provisions given for their members in the 6th Respondent-Society and he has also not exhausted the provisions of preferring Arbitration proceedings before the 1st Respondent under Section 90(2) of Tamilnadu Cooperative Societies Act, 1983. In short, the contention of the 7th Respondent is that the Petitioner has filed the present Writ Petition without ulterior measure and therefore, this Writ Petition is not maintainable, when the Petitioner has an effective, efficacious and an alternative remedy before the competent forum.

33. The Learned Counsel for the 7th Respondent also points out that the Board is the competent to Lease or otherwise deal with the site to the members or others, as it may determine, under these provisions of the Byelaws, the Board resolution dated 19.07.2013 was passed to lease the land to and in favour

of the School. The Petitioner's intention is to stop the educational service, which have intended to carryout in Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam Area for Children / families including the members of the 6th Respondent and Petitioner's family. The common property has been Leased out by the Society for purpose of which it is ear marked for the development of the School.

34. The Learned Counsel for the 7th Respondent contends that as per Byelaws 26(1) of the Society, the issues raised by the Petitioner are to be only adjudicated before the 6th Respondent / Society to get internal relief failing which, he has to prefer Arbitration under 90(2) of the Tamilnadu Cooperative Society. The resolution was passed in the duly elected 6th Respondent General Body Meeting on 07.12.2014, only after a period of three years namely, much after passing of an order dated 07.12.2014, the Petitioner has filed the present Writ Petition. Furthermore, the Petitioner's complaint is addressed to the Registrar of Tamilnadu Cooperative Societies and not even a copy was marked to the 7th Respondent or to others including the 2nd Respondent.

35. Suffice it for this Court to point out that all the records including the Lease Agreement entered into by the 7th Respondent with the 6th Respondent were in conformity with the guidelines of the 3rd Respondent / CMDA and the 4th Respondent / Corporation had accorded sanction, it is needless to stop the construction as directed by the 2nd Respondent against one complaint dated 05.10.2017, which was not addressed to him.

36. It is the submission of the Learned Counsel for the 7th Respondent that by Leasing the school ground, the Society has ensured educational services to the members and the local residents in Manapakkam and Mugalivakkam area where is no State Syllabus Higher Secondary School at present. Also that the said land was lying unutilised for more than 25 years and since the coming up of the school will ensure better income for the Society, welfare activities and recognition process were initiated by the 7th Respondent.

37. Lastly, the prime stand taken on behalf of the 7th Respondent is that for Admission, 2018, academic studies has been initiated and the same is under process by means of an issuance of application forms. At this eleventh hour, the Petitioner is endeavoring a futile bid to prevent the coming up of the school in the property in question.

38. It is not in dispute that the 3rd Respondent / CMDA had clearly mentioned in its counter that the planning permission of St. Joseph Educational Trust through its trustee was examined and

only after examination of the ownership of the property, planning permission was accorded on 03.03.2017. Further, it is represented that based on the planning permit issued by the 3rd Respondent / CMDA, the School had proceeded with the construction. Also that, this Court on going through the averments made in the Writ Affidavit filed by the Writ Petitioner is of the considered view that the Petitioner being a Member of the Society and he is complaining about the affairs of the 6th Respondent / Society, then, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is for the Writ Petitioner to work out his remedy for redressal of his grievances before the competent forum under Tamil Co-operative Societies Act, 1983. It is also open to him to approach the competent civil Court for redressal of his grievances, if he so desires / advised. This Court, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, of course, in a summary proceedings, is not inclined to go into the disputed questions of facts in the Writ Petition. Even on that count, the filing of the Writ Petition, by the Petitioner is not perse maintainable before this Court.

39. Insofar as the 5th Respondent on inspection of the school building found that there are violations in the side set back and the said report was forwarded to the 3rd Respondent on 23.11.2017 for taking appropriate action, because of the reason that the said permission was granted by the 3rd Respondent etc., this Court opines that if there are any violations made or constructions put up by the School, contrary to the Approved plan / planning permit, it is open to the 3rd Respondent and other authorities not to issue 'Completion Certificate to the School', till the School complies with the defects. Till the defects, if any, are rectified (as pointed out by the 3rd Respondent / CMDA) then, only after rectification or defects being set right by the School, they are entitled to obtain electricity supply and water connection.

In view of the foregoings, this Court holds that the Writ Petition is devoid of merits and the same is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-CCC)

WEB COPY
//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ssd

To

1. The Registrar
Tamilnadu Cooperative Societies
No.170, N.V.Natarajan Maaligai
Periyar EVR High Road Poonamallee
High Road, Kilpauk, Chennai - 600 010
2. The Deputy Registrar (Housing)
Chennai Zone,
Ramanathan Street, T.Nagar,
Chennai - 600 017

+1CC TO MR.K.S.Jayaganesan, Advocate S.R.No.19139
+1CC TO MR.N.Chinnaraj, Advocate S.R.No.19511
+2CC TO MR.Perumpulavil Radhakrishnan, Advocate S.R.No.19298
+1CC TO MR.C.Jonson, Advocate S.R.No.19762
+1CC TO MR.K.Soundararajan, Advocate S.R.No.20016
+1cc to The Government Pleader S.R.No.20076

W.P.No.34304 of 2017 and
W.M.P.Nos. 38175 of 2017 and 2181 of 2018

SVI (CO)
RMP (21/03/2018)



WEB COPY