



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. 8267 of 2013
and
M.P. (MD) Nos. 1 to 3 of 2013

G. Rajarathinam

.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Director of Town and Country
Planning,
No. 807, Anna Salai, Chennai.

2. The District Collector,
Kanyakumari District,
Nagercoil.

2. The Member Secretary,
Local Planning Authority,
No. 11A, Ramanpillai Street,
Ramavarmapuram,
Nagercoil-1,
Kanyakumari District.

... Respondents


PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned notice dated 11.02.2013 in Na.Ka.No.916 of 2011 as well as final proceedings dated 06.05.2013 on the file of the 3rd respondent and quash the same, and consequently directing the 3rd respondent to unseal the premises in Door No.48/3/110/1/105A Court Road, Nagercoil known as "Hotel Canan".

For Petitioner : Mr. F. Deepak
For Respondents : Mr. M. Govindan, Spl. G.P. For R1 and 2
For R3 : Mr. P. Athimoolapandian

O R D E R

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

The petitioner questions the impugned proceedings issued by the Local Planning Authority, Nagercoil.



2.The case of the petitioner is that the building in question was put up only after obtaining approval from the Nagercoil Municipality.

3.The third respondent has filed a typed set of papers, in which the deviations in respect of the building in question has been set out in a tabulated format. The same is as under:

Approval Details			Violation Details			
Approval		Present	Sl.No	Description of rule	Present condition at site	Violation
District Municipal Building Rules, 1972						
Ground + 1 floor	+ Ground + 4 floors	1.	11(4) 1/4 th set back	Not provided	100%	
		2.	12-Parking provision	Not provided	100%	
		3.	15(2) (g) stair case ventilation	Not provided	100%	
Multi-storied and Public Building Rules, 1973						
			1.	4(a) to be declared as MSB since it is beyond 4 storeys	Not declared	100%
			2.	4(b) Minimum width of plot to be 24.50 Mtr.	Not provided	100%
			3.	9-F S.I. - 100	Not provided	100%
			4.	9 Plot Coverage 50%	Not provided	100%
			5.	11(1) (b) Front set back all around atleast 6 mtr.	Not provided	100%
			6.	12(a) Access Way	Not provided	100%
			7.	12(2) Emergency Exit	Not Provided	100%
			8.	13-Parking facilities	Not provided	100%
			9.	14, 18 -Fire Safety norms to be adopted	No NOC obtained	100%
			10.	16(2) (b) Two exists		

4.The petitioner has not filed any rejoinder controverting the 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. The impugned communication merely calls upon the petitioner to remove the unauthorised constructions.

7. 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 has not really been explained by the writ petitioner.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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 are also dismissed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (RTI)

/True Copy/

Sub-Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Director of Town and Country Planning,
No.807, Anna Salai, Chennai.

2. The District Collector, Kanyakumari District, Nagercoil.

3. The Member Secretary, Local Planning Authority,
No.11A, Ramanpillai Street, Ramavarmapuram,
Nagercoil-1, Kanyakumari District.

+1cc to Mr.F.Deepak, Advocate, SR.No.55306

+1cc to The Special Government Pleader, SR.No.55699

Arul

RL/6C/3P/SKN/RSK/SAR1/19/4/2018

ORDER MADE IN

W.P. (MD) No.8267 of 2013

and

M.P. (MD) Nos.1 to 3 of 2013

13.03.2018