IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 1312.2019

DELIVERED ON : 20.12.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

W.P.NO.19414 OF 2008
&
M.P.NO.2 OF 2008

V.Krishnamurthy ... Petitioner

vs.

1. The Airport Authorityof India,
(Represented by its Chairman)
Rajiv Gandhi bahvan, Safdharjung Airport,
New Delhi.

2. The Airport Director,
Airport Authority of India,
Chennai International Airport,
Chennai - 600 027.

3. The Deputy General Manager (Commercial),
Airport Authority of India,
Chennai International Airport, Chennai - 600 027.

4. The Manager (F & A Revenue),
Airport Authority of India,
Chennai International Airport,
Chenani - 600 027. ...Respondents

Prayer:
Writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for writ of certiorari calling for the records relating to the circular issued by the third respondent dated 26.05.2008 AAM/LM-2817/2008 and quash the same in so far as the Petitioner is concerned.

For Petitioner :Mr.ARL.Sundaresan, Senior Counsel, for M/s.G.R.Associates

For Respondents :Mr.R.Parthiban

ORDER

The point for consideration in this writ petition is whether the alleged arbitrary and unilateral revision of license fee by an instrumentality of a State can be challenged in a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India when there exists an arbitration clause under the contract.

2. This writ petition has been filed challenging the circular issued by the third respondent dated 26.05.2008 revising the license fee payable by the petitioner under the license agreement entered into between the petitioner and the first respondent.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that he is running a coach service/car service in the name of M/s.Aviation Express. According to him, in the year 1986, he was granted the license by Airport authority for running car rental services which he was operating till 2003. According to the petitioner, the last tender for license for operation of air conditioned city coach service at national and international airports was invited by the Authority during March 2007 and he submitted his bid for the same. According to the petitioner, he was adjudged as a successful tenderer and the tender was awarded to him by proceedings of the third respondent dated 09.04.2007. According to the petitioner, the license is for a period of 5 years commencing from 16.04.2007 to 15.04.2012. According to the petitioner, a sum of Rs.72,000/- per month was fixed for the first year with ten percent annual compound escalation which means in the first year Rs.72,000/-, second year Rs.79,200/-, third year Rs.87,120/-, fourth year Rs.95,832/- and fifth year Rs.1,05,415/- will have to be paid.

4. It is also the case of the petitioner that for counter space measuring five square meters at Anna International Terminal Arrival Hall, license fee at Rs.786.36 per square meter per month (AC Area) and Rs.3,936.50 at Kamaraj Domestic Terminal Arrival Hall per month was fixed. According to him, likewise, with regard to the parking area, a sum of Rs.86,592/- per annum was fixed for the parking space of approximately 165 square meters at International Terminal and 55 square meters at Domestic Terminal at the rate of Rs.393.60 per square meter per annum.

5. It is the case of the petitioner that the space rent for the counter/coach parking areas are subject to revision from time to time with retrospective effect and the same shall be payable by the licensee. It is also the case of the petitioner that he had also deposited an amount equal to six months license

fees as security deposit in accordance with the award letter before execution of license agreement. It is also the case of the petitioner that he has strictly complied with the terms and conditions of the license agreement and has paid license fees upto date.

6. It is also the case of the petitioner that pursuant to his request, he has been alloted an additional parking area of 1079 square meter for which he has also been paying license fees at Rs.393.60 per square meter per annum with an annual compound escalation plus service tax as applicable.

7. It is the case of the petitioner that in the month of June 2008, the Senior Manager (Commercial) of the Airport authority communicated a circular dated 26.05.2008 issued by the third respondent. According to him, it was addressed to all Airlines/Agencies. According to the petitioner, the said circular intimated that the competent authority namely the second respondent has fixed the rates applicable from 01.04.2008 to 31.03.2011 which are as follows:

"LICENSE FEE FOR CHENNAI AIRPORT
a) Land Rupees 1,952.00/- per square meter/per annum.
b) Paved land Rs.2,342.40/- per square meter/per annum.

8. According to the petitioner, the effect of the circular is that as against the existing rate of Rs.393.60 per square meter, the rate has been increased for the land at Rs.1,952.00 per square meter per annum and paved land at Rs.2,342.40 per square meter per annum i.e., more than five times. According to the petitioner, the circular also contemplates further escalation of 7.5% for the license fee for the land and paved land.

9. According to the petitioner, all the license holders in the Airport objected to this arbitrary increase. However, according to the petitioner, the fourth respondent has sent a bill dated 18.07.2008 to him claiming the difference amount.

10. Aggrieved by the alleged arbitrary fixation of license fee under the impugned circular of the third respondent dated 26.05.2008, this writ petition has been filed challenging the said circular.

11. The petitioner has pleaded in his affidavit filed in support of the writ petition that though the general terms and conditions of the license agreement contains an arbitration clause, the arbitrary escalation of the parking fees violates Article 14 of the Constitution of India and there has also been a violation of principles of natural justice as the licensees

were not put on notice by the respondents before escalating the parking fees and hence, according to the petitioner, the writ petition is maintainable.

12. According to the petitioner, the increase of over 500 percent (i.e. 5 times) of the parking rates by the respondent, that too, within a year of the award of the contract is clearly arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India. According to him, any power under which the respondents claim right to increase the rate unilaterally is clearly arbitrary and unconscionable and thereby offends the equality clause in the Constitution.

13. A counter affidavit has been filed by the respondents stating that the writ petition is not maintainable in view of the arbitration clause contained under the license agreement. According to the respondents, the contractual rights cannot be enforced in proceedings under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. According to them, the agreement itself provides for variation in the rates and it also has an arbitration clause, which provides for resolution of disputes and hence, according to them, the writ petition is not maintainable and is liable to be dismissed.

14. According to the respondents, the issue concerning rationalization of license fee for land and space at all Airports in India was engaging the attention of Airports Authority of India and it was considered by the Board of Airport Authority of India at its 119th Board Meeting on 07.04.2008. According to the respondents, after detailed deliberations, the Board approved the rationalization of rates of license fee for land and space for a period of three years from 01.04.2008 to 31.03.2011 in respect of Airports falling under different regions. Accordingly, the circular was issued on 26.05.2008 stating the following parameters:-

> (i) The approved rates of license fee for land at different airports categorized under Group I & V as on 01.04.2008 are shown at Annexure-I.
>
> (ii) The approved rates of license fee for space at different airports categorized under Group A to D as on 01.04.2008 are shown at Annexure-II.
>
> (iii) The existing rates of the license fee for land and space at airport(s) which are more than the approved rates indicated in Annexure I & II respectively will however continue to be applied and will be frozen for a maximum period of 3 years or till such time the approved rates at the particular group of airport(s) increases to the level of the existing higher rate of license fee, whichever is

earlier.

(iv) The minimum rate of license fee for land and space as approved in respect of a particular group of airport(s) will apply at small airport(s) which are not covered in Annexure-I & II.

(v) The land and space at the airports to Central Government Department for performing their mandatory /regulatory functions will be provided by charging 50% of the applicable normal license fee. This concession will not apply in favour of the Public Sector Undertakings.

(vi) the license fee hangar space and other ancillary buildings will be at par to the rate of space license fee applicable in respect of non-a/c terminal buildings. However, higher rate of hangar license fee wherever existing will apply without any cumulative annual increase as defined in sub-para (iii) above.

(vii) The license fee for paved land in the operational area will be 20% higher than the basic rate of land license fee applicable at a particular airport.

(viii) Land for access through Airport Authority of India land / laying of underground cables/pipeline will be considered only under exceptional circumstances and is subject to approval of terms and conditions and rates as decided by Airport Authority of India Board.

(ix) The prevailing terms and conditions of the agreement will apply in respect of all the ongoing lease / licences for land / space /trading concessions.

(x) The rate now being revised w.e.f. 1.4.2008 will be reviewed after 03 years. However, annual compound escalation @ 7.5% in respect of the rates of license fee for land and space at various airports will apply except in cases where the higher rates are prevailing and frozen as per para (iii) above.

(xi) The existing rate of license fee for land and space may be compounded annually @ 7.5% every year for the past period from 1.4.2006 to 31.3.2008, if not already done."

15. On the basis of the circular dated 26.05.2008, the respondents issued a notice to the petitioner to pay the difference in the license fee. According to the respondents, the rationalization has been made in respect of all airports and all persons who were occupying space in the airports would be bound to pay the license fee in accordance with the rates decided as

per the rationalization structure. According to them, it is not open to the petitioner to object to this rationalization or to challenge the same. It is their case that if the petitioner feels that he is not in a position to pay this amount, he need not continue with the contract. According to them, the question of violation of Article 14 and 19(1)(g) would not arise.

16. According to the respondents, the parking fees were at a very much lower level and therefore, a decision had to be taken to rationalize the fees structure. According to the respondents, the petitioner has been enjoying unintended benefits in the past by the lower rates of license fees and according to them, the increase cannot be stated to be arbitrary or illegal or in violation of any article of the Constitution or the doctrine of natural justice. According to them, once the petitioner has signed the contract, which reserved the right to the Airport Authority of India to revise the fees, it is not open to the petitioner to apply the principle of arbitrariness or violation of principles of natural justice.

17. Heard, Mr.ARL.Sundaresan, learned Senior counsel assisted by Mr.Niranjan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.R.Parthiban, learned counsel for the respondents.

18. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner drew the attention of this Court to clause IV of the terms and conditions of the license and pointed out that though the agreement provides for revision of license fee from time to time with retrospective effect, the revision cannot be arbitrary. According to him, at the time of grant of license on 09.04.2007, as seen from clause-IV(c), the monthly license fee payable by the petitioner for the parking place of approximately 165 square meters at Anna International Terminal and 55 square meters at Kamaraj Domestic Terminal city side was fixed at Rs.86,592/- per annum at the rate of Rs.393.60 per square meter per annum, but under the impugned circular it has been increased by more than five times arbitrarily.

19. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner also drew the attention of this Court to the impugned circular dated 26.05.2008 and pointed out that the respondents have arbitrarily enhanced the license fee for the period from 01.04.2008 to 31.03.2011 for (a) Land at Rs.1,952.00/- per square meter/per annum and (b) Paved land at Rs.2,342.40/- per square meter/per annum. Further, he pointed out that apart from the revision of the license fee for land as well as paved land, the respondents have also levied annual compound escalation at 7.5% in respect of rates of the license for land and paved land.

20. According to the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, within a span of one year from the date of award of the contract, the respondents have arbitrarily enhanced the license fee from the existing rate at Rs.393.60 per square meter to Rs.1,952 per square meter per annum for the land and Rs.2,342.40/- per square meter per annum for the paved land i.e., by more than five times of the existing rate.

21. According to the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, the arbitrary escalation of parking fee violates Article 14 of the Constitution of India and there has also been a violation of principles of natural justice, since the petitioner was not put on notice by the respondents before enhancing the parking fees. According to him, any power under which the respondents claim right to increase the rate unilaterally is clearly arbitrary and unconscionable. According to him, the respondents being an instrumentality of State as per Article 12 of the Constitution of India cannot arbitrarily enhance the license fee without adhering to the principles of natural justice. Hence, according to him, even though the contract contains an arbitration clause, the writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is maintainable. Hence, he seeks for quashing of the impugned circular dated 26.05.2008.

22. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner drew the attention of this Court to the following authorities:

(a) Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Jamshed Hormusji Wadia vs. Board of Trustees, Port of Mumbai and Another reported in (2004) 3 SCC 214;

(b) Division Bench Judgment of the Bombay High Court in the case of Persis Kothawalla vs. Life Insurance Corporation of India & another reported in (2004) 4 BOM CR 610;

(c) Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ABL International Ltd., and Another vs. Export Credit Guarantee Corporation of India Ltd., and others reported in (2004) 3 SCC 553;

(d) Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Harbanslal Sahnia and Another vs. Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. and Others reported in 2003 (1) CTC 189 (SC);

(e) Full Bench Judgment of the Madras High Court in the case of Aluminium Industries Ltd., Madras vs. Minerals & Metals Trading Corporation of India Ltd., reported in 1997 (II) CTC 636

Referring to the aforesaid decisions, the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner would submit that the respondents being an instrumentality of the State while revising the license fee payable by the petitioner cannot act arbitrarily by revising the license fee within a period of one year from the date of the contract by enhancing the same by more than five times as they ought to act justly, fairly and reasonably in all their activities including those in the field of contracts.

23. According to the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, since the petitioner is seeking enforcement of his fundamental right to carry on his business under Article 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India and the respondents under the impugned circular having unilaterally revised the parking fees by more than five times which violates Article 14 of the Constitution of India, the writ petition is maintainable even though there exists an arbitration clause under the contract.

24. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondents would submit that being a contractual dispute and due to the existence of an arbitration clause under the contract, the only remedy available for the petitioner is to approach the arbitrator as per the arbitration clause contained in the contract.

25. Learned counsel for the respondents drew the attention of this Court to the following authorities namely:

(a) Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Har Shankar and Other vs. The Deputy Excise and Taxation Commissioner and others reported in (1975) 1 SCC 737;

(b) Judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Gail (India) Limited vs. Gujarat State Petroleum Corporation Limited reported in (2014) 1 SCC 329

Referring to the aforesaid decisions, the learned counsel for the respondents would submit that when the contract entered into between the petitioner and the respondents is purely a commercial contract and the contract also provides for revision of license fees, the only remedy available to the petitioner is to go by way of arbitration as per the arbitration clause and hence, according to him, the writ petition is not maintainable.

26. The learned counsel for the respondents also brought to the notice of this Court an arbitral award dated 06.08.2019 passed by an Arbitral Tribunal in a dispute between M/s.Bhadra International (India) Pvt. Ltd., vs. Airports Authority of India. According to the learned counsel for the respondents, in an identical dispute, an arbitral award has been passed directing the contractor to pay the enhanced license fee as per the contract. According to the learned counsel for the respondents, the dispute raised by the petitioner in this writ petition was also raised in the aforesaid arbitration and the arbitral Tribunal where a Former Judge of the Supreme Court acted as an Arbitrator held that the contractor is liable to pay the enhanced license charges to the Airports Authority of India as per the revision of license charges.

Discussion:

27. The case of the petitioner is that the respondents have arbitrarily enhanced the license fee more than five times without affording any opportunity to the petitioner and without

any notice. According to the petitioner, the respondents have violated Article 14 and 19(1)(g) of the Constitution of India.

28. However, it is the case of the respondents that under clause IV (c) of the terms and conditions of the license, the respondents are having the power to enhance the license fee. According to them, exercising the said power, they have enhanced the license fee payable by the licensees under the impugned circular. Further it is their case that the contract contains an arbitration clause and hence, the writ petition is not maintainable.

29. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Jamshed Hormusji Wadia vs. Board of Trustees, Port of Mumbai and Another reported in (2004) 3 SCC 214 relied upon by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, while dealing with an identical matter involving the notice of termination issued to a lessee, terminating the tenancy, but with an option that the lessee would continue as lessee subject to agreeing to pay the revised rent fixed in pursuance of the report submitted by experts observed as follows:

> "An instrumentality of the State in all its actions, it must be governed by Article 14 of the Constitution. It cannot afford to act with arbitrariness or capriciousness and its actions must be for the public good, achieving the objects for which it exists and accompanied by reason and not whim or caprice. The State and its authorities including instrumentality of the State have to be just, fair and reasonable in all their activities including those in the fields of contract. In the fields of contract, the State and its instrumentalities ought to so design their activities as would ensure fair competition and non-discrimination. They can augment their resources but the object should be to serve the public cause and to do public good by resorting to fair and reasonable methods. Even while playing the role of a landlord or a tenant, the State and its authorities remain so and cannot be heard or seen causing displeasure or discomfort to Article 14 of the Constitution of India. The State and its instrumentalities, as the landlords, have the liberty of revising the rates of rent so as to compensate themselves against loss caused by inflationary tendencies. The State, as landlord, need not necessarily be a benevolent and good charitable Samaritan. The felt need for expanding or stimulating its own activities or other activities in the public interest having once

arisen, the State need not hold its hands from seeking eviction of its lessees. However, the State cannot be seen to be indulging in rack-renting, profiteering and indulging in whimsical or unreasonable evictions or bargains. A balance has to be struck between the two extremes. The validity of their actions in the field of landlord-tenant relationship is available to be tested not under the rent control legislation but under the Constitution. The rent control legislations are temporary, if not seasonal; the Constitution is permanent and all time law."

30. As seen from the aforesaid judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is clear that as an instrumentality of the State, the respondents while enhancing the license fee, that too, within a period of one year from the date of the contract, ought to have put the petitioner on notice about the proposed revision of license fee as per clause IV (c) of the terms and conditions of the license. Further in the case on hand, as per the impugned circular dated 26.05.2008, the respondents within a period of one year from the date of contract awarded to the petitioner has unilaterally enhanced the license fee by more than five times without any notice to the petitioner. As an instrumentality of the State, as held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the respondents ought to have acted fairly and reasonably before enhancing the license fee and they should not have acted arbitrarily by unilaterally enhancing the license fee without prior notice by more than five times over and above the existing license fee payable by the petitioner.

31. As seen from the impugned circular, the license fee has been enhanced by five times without assigning any reason for such steep revision. The license fee was fixed at Rs.86,592/- in the year 2007 at the rate of Rs.393.60 per square meter per annum. However under the impugned circular dated 26.05.2008 within a period of one year, the respondents have enhanced the monthly license fee by five times for land at Rs.1,952/- per square meter per annum and paved land at Rs.2,342.40 per square meter per annum.

32. In the considered view of this Court, the unilateral enhancement of the monthly license fee payable by the licensee, by the respondents under the impugned circular is arbitrary and unreasonable and violates the principles of natural justice. Though the contract provides for revision/enhancement of license fee, the said revision/enhancement cannot be done arbitrarily, unreasonably and in violation of principles of natural justice, that too, when the enhancement is five times over and above the existing license fee payable by the licensees under their

respective contracts.

33. The decision relied upon by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner reported in (2004) 3 SCC 214 referred to supra is squarely applicable for the facts of the instant case. However, regarding fixation of the revised license fees, this Court is not empowered to fix the same under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. If that is done, it will amount to arbitrary fixation of license fees without any material evidence in support of such fixation.

34. In the decision reported in (2004) 3 SCC 214, cited by the learned Senior Counsel, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has fixed the rent based on a compromise proposal exercising power under Article 142 of the Constitution of India, which power the High Courts does not have. It is for the respondents to fix the revised rent after hearing the petitioner by placing relevant materials/evidence in support of the same. However, as observed above, the respondents have arbitrarily enhanced the license fees payable by the petitioner violating the principles of natural justice as well as Article 14 of the Constitution of India and hence the impugned circular will have to be struck down.

35. The Division Bench judgment of the Bombay High Court in the case of Persis of Kothawalla vs. Life Insurance Corporation of India and another reported in 2004 (4) Bom CR 610 relied upon by the learned Senior Counsel also supports the case of the petitioner. The Bombay High Court has also held that the Life Insurance Corporation of India, being a public entity ought to act fairly and reasonably and its action will have to stand the test of reasonableness. In that case, LIC arbitrarily increased the rent many times without disclosing the basis for such steep increase. The Bombay High Court held that the said action is arbitrary, irrational and capricious and would clearly violate Article 14 of the Constitution of India. The facts of the case on hand being similar in nature, this Court is in agreement with the view taken by the Bombay High Court.

36. The judgments which are relied upon by the learned counsel for the respondents in the case of Har Shankar and Others vs. The Deputy Excise and Taxation Commissioner and others reported in (1975) 1 SCC 737 as well as in the case of Gail (India) Limited vs. Gujarat State Petroleum Corporation Limited reported in (2014) 1 SCC 329 are not identical to the facts of the instant case.

37. In the case of Har Shankar and Others vs. The Deputy Excise and Taxation Commissioner and others reported in (1975) 1 SCC 737 referred to supra, that was a case where there was a

contract awarded to a successful bidder by the Government and terms and conditions were stipulated therein and the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that when the contract was entered into with open eyes by the contractor, he must accept the burdens of the contract along with its benefits and cannot wriggle out of his contractual obligations by filing a writ petition. In the case on hand, the petitioner has not accepted the quantum of the enhanced license fee as per the impugned circular under the contract with the respondents. The petitioner has only agreed for revision of monthly license fee at the option of the respondents and the exact figure of enhancement of the monthly license fee has not been agreed upon by the petitioner.

38. In the judgment cited by the respondents reported in (1975) 1 SCC 737 as well as the Judgment reported in (2014) 1 SCC 329, the Hon'ble Supreme Court did not deal with similar facts as in the case on hand. In both the decisions, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has dealt with cases where the contractor tries to wriggle out of the contract for his own fault in not adhering to the terms and conditions of the contract. Therefore, both the Judgments relied upon by the learned counsel for the respondents are not applicable to the facts of the instant case.

39. By the impugned circular, without issuing any prior notice and without getting the acceptance of the petitioner, the respondents have arbitrarily enhanced the monthly license fee by more than five times, that too, within one year from the date of the contract. There must be an offer and acceptance for a contract. In the case on hand, there is no acceptance by the petitioner for the amount fixed by the respondent towards the enhanced license fee payable by him as per the impugned circular, though he has agreed for revision of license fee under the contract. Since the respondents have violated the principles of natural justice by not affording opportunity to the petitioner before enhancing the monthly license fee by more than five times and the petitioner has also not been given opportunity to produce all the relevant materials/evidence with regard to the market rate when the revision/enhancement was made, the petitioner is entitled to file a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. When there is no acceptance of the revised license fees (figures contained in the impugned circular) by the petitioner, there cannot be any contract. This being the case, the arbitration clause contained in the contract will not apply to the facts of the instant case as there is no agreement for payment of the revised license fees as per the impugned circular of the respondents. Hence, the writ petition is very much maintainable.

40. The arbitral award dated 06.08.2019 passed in arbitration case No.2 of 2018 by a former Judge of the Supreme Court of India involves a dispute between a third party and the respondents. Admittedly, the petitioner is not a party to the said dispute. The decision of the Arbitral Tribunal referred to supra is not binding on the petitioner as he is not a party to the said dispute. Anyway, the said arbitral award has also not attained finality as it is subject to challenge. Therefore, the arbitral award dated 06.08.2019 passed in Arbitration case No.2 of 2018 does not have any bearing to the case on hand.

41. As observed earlier, the impugned circular dated 26.05.2008 issued by the third respondent is arbitrary and violates the principles of natural justice.

42. In the result, the impugned circular dated 26.05.2008 passed by the third respondent is hereby quashed and the matter is remanded back to the third respondent for fresh consideration as per the revision of license charges under clause IV-c of the terms and conditions of the license agreement. The third respondent shall pass final orders regarding enhancement of license charges payable by the petitioner till the date of expiry of the license within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a copy of this Order after giving sufficient opportunity to the petitioner to raise all contentions including granting him the right of personal hearing.

43. With the above directions, this writ petition is disposed of. No costs. Consequently connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VI)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

nl

To

1. The Chairman,
   The Airport Authorityof India,
   Rajiv Gandhi bahvan, Safdharjung Airport,
   New Delhi.

2. The Airport Director,
   Airport Authority of India,
   Chennai International Airport,
   Chennai - 600 027.

3. The Deputy General Manager (Commercial),
   Airport Authority of India,
   Chennai International Airport,
   Chennai - 600 027.

4. The Manager (F & A Revenue),
   Airport Authority of India,
   Chennai International Airport,
   Chenani - 600 027.

+1cc to Mr.R.Parthiban, Advocate, S.R.No.106156
+1cc to M/s.G.R.Associates, Advocate, S.R.No.106097

W.P.No.19414 of 2008

SSV(CO)
CS/31/01/2020