

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12.02.2018

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM

W.P. No.2911 of 2018

Razendhiran Maleappane

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Revenue Officer-II,
Puducherry Municipality,
Puducherry.

2. The Commissioner,
Puducherry Municipality,
Puducherry.

3.Manet Ravi

4.Pratap Pierre Gerard De Condappa

.. Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the first and second respondents to consider the claim of the petitioner herein, pertaining to the trade license to ensure the running of the business at Le Club & Hotel De Pondicherry at No.38, Dumas Street, Pondicherry-605 001 by the petitioner herein by passing, appropriate orders on his representation dated 19.01.2018 and to consequently forbear the respondents from interfering in the day to day affairs of the business.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Ravi

For Respondents: Mr.J.Kumaran

Government Advocate

(Pondicherry) for R1 & R2

O R D E R

The petitioner has come forward with the present Writ Petition seeking issuance of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 and 2 to consider the claim of the petitioner pertaining to the trade license to ensure the running of the business at Le Club & Hotel De Pondicherry, No.38, Dumas Street, Pondicherry-605 001, based on his representation dated 19.01.2018 and consequently, forbear the respondents from interfering in the day to day affairs of the business.

2. By consent of both sides, the writ petition is taken up for final disposal.

3. Heard Mr.M.Ravi, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.J.Kumaran, learned Government Advocate (Pondicherry) for the respondents 1 and 2 and perused the records.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that as per the agreement / arrangement with the third respondent, the petitioner is running the business in the license taken in the name of the third respondent. Due to the dispute between the petitioner and the third respondent, an attempt is being made to cancel the trade license and hence, the petitioner submitted a representation on 19.01.2018 and reminder on 22.01.2018. It is further submitted that it would suffice, if a direction is issued to the respondents 1 and 2 to consider the representation of the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate for the respondents 1 and 2 submitted that the representation of the petitioner would be considered in accordance with law.

6. In the light of the prayer sought for in the Writ Petition and submissions of the learned Government Advocate for the respondents 1 and 2, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, directs the respondents 1 and 2 to pass appropriate orders on the representation of the petitioner dated 19.01.2018 and the reminder dated 22.01.2018 on merits and in accordance with law, after providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner as well as to the respondents 3 and 4.

7. With the above direction, the Writ Petition is disposed of. There is no order as to costs.

-s/d-

Assistant Registrar (CS-IV)

True Copy

Sub-Assistant Registrar

r n s

To

1. The Revenue Officer-II,
Puducherry Municipality,
Puducherry.

2. The Commissioner,
Puducherry Municipality,
Puducherry.

+1 CC to Mr.M. Ravi, Advocate sr 10714.
+1 CC to Govt. Pleader sr 11102.

W.P.No.2911 of 2018

KS (CO)
SP (27/02/2018)



WEB COPY