

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED: 14.08.2019
CORAM
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM
W.P.Nos.6987 and 6988 of 2014
and
M.P.Nos.1, 2 and 2 of 2014

S.Saravanaswamy ... Petitioner
Represented by his Power Agent in W.P.No.6987 of 2014
Tmt.Preetha Narasimman

S.Saravanaswamy ... Petitioner
in W.P.No.6988 of 2014

Vs.

1.The District Collector,
Collectorate,
Kanchipuram,
Kanchipuram District.

2.The Tahsildar,
Shozhinganallur Taluk,
Shozhinganallur,
Kanchipuram District.

3.G.Balaji

4.Sathish Mohan

5.G.Jayanthi

6.Kingsley Amose Pandian

7.Susi Vanitha Kingsley

... Respondents
in both W.Ps

Common Prayer : Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorari, to call for the records of the 1st respondent in proceedings No.Na.Ka.No.30267/2014/N3, dated 13.2.2014 and proceedings No.Na.Ka.No. 30267/2013/N3 dated 27.02.2014 and quash the same as without jurisdiction, illegal, arbitrary and non est in law and consequently direct the 1st respondent to drop all further proceedings in respect of petitioner's property comprised in S.No.208/3 in Injambakkam Village, Shozhinganallur Taluk, Kanchipuram District.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Vijay
in both W.Ps

For Respondents :Mr.I.Sathish
Additional Government Pleader
for R1 & R2 in both W.Ps
Mr.R.Asokan for R3 to R5
in both W.Ps
Mr.P.Jagadeesan for R6 & R7
in both W.Ps

C O M M O N O R D E R

Heard Mr.B.Vijay, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr.I.Sathish, learned Additional Government Pleader for the respondents 1 and 2, Mr.R.Asokan, learned counsel for the respondents 3 to 5, Mr.P.Jagadeesan, learned counsel for the respondents 6 and 7 and perused the materials available on record.

2. This writ petition has been filed challenging the enquiry notice issued by the first respondent-District Collector, Kancheepuram, dated 13.2.2014 and 27.2.2014.

3. It seems that as against the order of the Revenue Divisional Officer, Tambaram, the private respondents preferred an appeal before the District Collector, Kancheepuram. The petitioners would contend that the District Revenue Officer is the competent authority to entertain the appeal and not the District Collector. Hence, the present writ petition has been filed.

4. It is represented by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the appeal preferred before the District Collector, Kancheepuram is now transferred to the District Revenue Officer, Kancheepuram and he has to contest the appeal preferred by the private respondents. It is also represented that the Kancheepuram District has been bifurcated and new Chengalpattu District is formed and the subject property is situated in Shozhinganallur Taluk, which comes under the jurisdiction of Greater Chennai Corporation, the District Revenue Officer, Chennai, is the Competent Authority to deal with the Appeals.

5. In the light of the above submission, this Court, directs the District Revenue Officer, Chennai to dispose of the appeal preferred by the private respondents as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, after affording an opportunity of personal hearing to all necessary parties.

6. With the above direction, these writ petitions are disposed of. However, there shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-
Asst.Registrar (CS IV)

/true copy/

Sub Asst. Registrar

ms

To

1.The District Collector,
Collectorate,
Kanchipuram,
Kanchipuram District.

2.The Tahsildar,
Shozhinganallur Taluk,
Shozhinganallur,
Kanchipuram District.

+1 cc to Mr.B.Vijay Advocate sr70321

+1 cc to the Government Pleader sr69712

+1 cc to M/s.R.Asokan Advocate sr69697

+1 cc to M/s.D.Jagadeesan Advocate sr69232

W.P.Nos.6987 and 6988 of 2014
and

M.P.Nos.1, 2 and 2 of 2014

rgn(co)
aa17/10/2019

WEB COPY