



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Reserved on : 29.08.2017
Pronounced on : 13.03.2018

WEB COPY

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.K. SASIDHARAN
and
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.R. SWAMINATHAN

W.P. (MD) No. 8199 of 2013
and
M.P. (MD) No. 1 of 2013

Shree Gokulam Chit and Finance Company
Pvt. Ltd.,
Rep. by R. Sudhakaran

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Member Secretary,
Local Planning Authority,
11-A, Ramanpillai Street,
P.D. Pillai Marriage Hall,
Ramavarmapuram,
Nagercoil,
Kanyakumari District.

2. The District Collector,
Kanyakumari District,
Nagercoil.

... Respondents


PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to remove the seal and lock of Door No. 299-R situated at Ramasubramaniam Shopping Complex, Veeppamoodu Junction, Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District based on the petitioner's representation dated 06.05.2013.

For Petitioner : Mr. K. P. Narayanakumar
For Respondents : Mr. M. Govindan, Spl. G.P.

O R D E R

[Order of the Court was made by **G.R. SWAMINATHAN, J.**]

The petitioner seeks a direction to direct the respondents to remove the seal and lock of Door No. 299-R situated at Ramasubramaniam Shopping Complex, Veeppamoodu Junction, Nagercoil,



Kanyakumari District based on the petitioner's representation dated 06.05.2013.

2.The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner after getting plan approval from the municipal authorities put up a commercial complex in Door No.299-R situated at Ramasubramaniam Shopping Complex, Veeppamoodu Junction, Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District. Since some deviations were noted, the first respondent, the local planning authority locked and sealed the premises without any prior notice on 06.05.2013. Instead of challenging the same, on the same day, the petitioner sent representation to the authorities seeking to remove the lock and seal of the premises. Since the same has not been considered so far, the petitioner has filed this present writ petition for disposing of his representation dated 06.05.2013.

3.The first respondent has filed a counter affidavit, in which the deviations in respect of the building in question have been set out in a tabulated format. The same is as under:

Sl. No.	Description of rule	Present condition at site	Violation
District Municipal Building Rules, 1972			
1.	11(4) one fourth open space	Not provided	100%
2.	12-Parking space	Not provided	100%
3.	14(1) 1/8 ventilation	Not provided	100%
5.	15(2) (g) staircase ventilation 1.50 sq.m.	Not provided	100%
Multi-storied and Public Building Rules, 1973			
1.	4(a) declared as MSB	Not provided	100%
2.	4(b) Minimum width of site	Not provided	100%
	Minimum area of plot 4 grounds	Not provided	100%
3.	9-F S.I. - 100	Not provided	100%
	Plot Coverage 50%	Not provided	100%
4.	11(1) (b) open space around 5 m	Not provided	100%
5.	12(2) Emergency Exit	Not Provided	100%
6.	13-Parking facilities for every 200 sq.m. - 20 sq.m. for shops and for 6 beds-20 sqm. For lodging	Not provided	100%
7.	14-Fire NOC	Not Provided	100%



4.The petitioner has not filed any rejoinder controverting the aforesaid allegations made by the authority with respect to the deviations committed by the petitioner.

5.We have heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6.Though in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the petitioner has contended that the building was constructed after taking permission from the local planning authority, the deviations highlighted in the counter affidavit have not really been explained by the writ petitioner.

7.In any event, there is a statutory remedy available to the petitioner under Section 80(A) of the Tamil Nadu Town and Country Planning Act, 1971. The petitioner without resorting to the specific remedy available under the Act, has rushed to this Court and obtained an interim order.

8.The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Dipak Kumar Mukherjee Vs. Kolkatta Municipal Corporation (2013 (5) SCC 336)** observed that illegal and unauthorised construction of buildings and other structures not only violate the Municipal Laws and the concept of planned development of the particular area but also affect various fundamental and constitutional rights of other persons.

9.The building in question is used by the public. It is a commercial building. Since the public are using the building, it must have a structurally sound building. There is nothing on record to see that the building was constructed in adherence to the safety standards. In any case, the local authority was correct in taking enforcement action. We are therefore of the view that there is no ground made out in this writ petition. We therefore dismiss the writ petition. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions is also dismissed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(rti)

/True Copy/

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Member Secretary,
Local Planning Authority,
11-A, Ramanpillai Street,
P.D.Pillai Marriage Hall,
Ramanpillai Puram,
Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District.



2. The District Collector,
Kanyakumari District,
Nagercoil.

+ 1 cc TO Mr.K.P.Narayana Kumar , Advocate in SR No. 55174
+ 1 cc TO The Special Government Pleader in SR No. 55692

Arul

AE/KKR/SAR3/19.04.2018/4P/5C

ORDER MADE IN

W.P. (MD) No.8199 of 2013
and
M.P. (MD) No.1 of 2013
13.03.2018