

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved On	16.04.2019 / 29.04.2019
Pronounced On	25.07.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE **MR.JUSTICE C.SARAVANAN****C.R.P.(NPD).Nos.265, 729 & 730 of 2014**

Gnanou Yeves Marie Daniel
rep by his Power of Attorney Agent,
Dr.Rajakumar Selvanathan

.. Petitioner
in all C.R.Ps

VS

Vincent Mathews (died)
1.Simi
2.T.A.Vikneswaran

.. Respondents
in all C.R.Ps

Common Prayer in C.R.P.(NPD).Nos.265 & 729 of 2014: Civil Revision Petitions filed under Section 25 of Pondicherry Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1969 to set aside the fair and final orders dated 10.10.2013 passed by the Principal District Judge, Puducherry in R.C.A.Nos.41 & 37 of 2011 reversing the order dated 29.07.2011 in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007.

Prayer in C.R.P.(NPD).Nos.730 of 2014: Civil Revision Petitions filed under Section 25 of Pondicherry Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1969 to set aside the fair and final order dated 10.10.2013 passed by the Principal District Judge, Puducherry in R.C.A.No.40 of 2011 in so far as it remits H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 back to the Learned Rent Controller for fresh disposal.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.A.Diwakar in all C.R.Ps.

For Respondents : M/s.V.Kamala Kumar for M/s.Sai
Bharath Associations in all C.R.Ps.

COMMON ORDER

By this common order all the three Civil Revision Petitions are being disposed. All the three Civil Revision Petitions are at the behest of the petitioner-landlord.

Details of the order impugned in the respective Civil Revision Petitions are as under :-

		Original proceedings		Appellate Proceedings	
C.R.P.(NPD) .No	Order date	Status of the H.C.R.O.Ps		Order date	Status of the R.C.As
265 of 2014	29.07.2011	H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007 (filed by the petitioner herein)		10.10.2013	R.C.A.No.41 of 2011 (filed by the petitioner herin)
729 of 2014	29.07.2011	H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007 (filed by the petitioner herein)		10.10.2013	R.C.A.No.37 of 2011 (filed by the respondents herin)
730 of 2014	29.07.2011	H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007		10.10.2013	R.C.A.No.40 of 2011 (filed by the petitioner herein)

3.The petitioner is an absentee landlord of the property which according to him was rented out to one Vincent Mathews alias Vincent Mathias through the agency of his power of attorney Dr.Rajkumar Selvanathan.

4.According to the petitioner, the property was rented out only to the said Vincent Mathews who not only defaulted in payment of the rent but had sub-let the property to the respondents herein. Therefore, the petitioner filed H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007 before the Rent Controller to evict the respondents herein without any authorisation.

5.The above petition was filed by the petitioner herein before the Rent Controller under Sections 10(2)(i), 10(2)(ii) (a) and 10 (3) (a) (iii) i.e for wilful default in payment of rent, for sub letting to the respondent herein and for owners accommodation.

6.The respondents also filed parallel proceedings in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 under under Section 8 (5) of the Pondicherry Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1969.

7.While passing the order in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007 the Rent Controller framed the following points for consideration:-

- i. Whether there is a landlord and tenant relationship is in existence between the petitioner and the first respondent on the date of filing of the present application?
- ii. Whether the respondents 2 and 3 are the tenants to the petition premises under the petitioner?
- iii. Whether the petitioner is entitled for an order of eviction on the ground of willful default?
- iv. Whether the petitioner is entitled for an order of eviction on the ground of sub-let?
- v. Whether the petitioner is entitled for an order of eviction on the ground that the petition premises needed for his personal occupation?

8. For the purpose of easy reference, relevant portion of these provision read as under:-

8. Right of tenant paying rent or advance to receipt.—

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)

(5) If the landlord refuses to receive the rent remitted by money order under sub-section (4), the tenant may deposit the rent before the Controller and continue to deposit with him any rent which may subsequently become due in respect of the building.

10. Eviction of tenants.— (1) A tenant shall not be evicted whether in execution of a decree or otherwise except in accordance with the provisions of this section or sections 14 to 16: Provided that where the tenant denies the title of the landlord or claims right of permanent tenancy, the Controller shall decide whether the denial or claim is **bona fide** and if he records a finding to that effect, the landlord shall be entitled to sue for eviction of the tenant in a Civil Court and the Court may pass a decree for eviction on any of the grounds mentioned in the

said sections, notwithstanding that the Court finds that such denial does not involve forfeiture of the lease or that the claim is unfounded.

(2) A landlord who seeks to evict his tenant shall apply to the Controller for a direction in that behalf. If the Controller, after giving the tenant a reasonable opportunity of showing cause against the application, is satisfied—

(i) that the tenant has not paid or tendered the rent due by him in respect of the building, within fifteen days after the expiry of the time fixed in the agreement of tenancy with his landlord or in the absence of any such agreement, by the last day of the month next following that for which the rent is payable, or

(ii) that the tenant has after the commencement of this Act without the written consent of the landlord—

(a) transferred his right under the lease or sub-let the entire building or any portion thereof, if the lease does not confer on him any right to do so, or

(b) used the building for a purpose other than that for which it was leased, or

(iii).....

(iv).....

(v)

(vi)

(vii)

(3)(a) A landlord may, subject to the provisions of clause (d), apply to the Controller for an order directing the tenant put the landlord in possession of the building—

(i)

(ii)

(iii) in case it is any other non-residential building, if the landlord or his son is not occupying for purposes of a business which he or his son is carrying on a non-residential building of his own in the Commune concerned:

(i).....

(ii).....

(b)

(c)

(d) Where the tenancy is for a specified period agreed upon between the landlord and the

tenant, the landlord shall not be entitled to apply under this sub-section before the expiry of such period.

(e)

9.The said Vincent Mathews was set *exparte* on 08.10.2007 in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007. During the course of the proceeding the said Vincent Mathews also died. The petitioner was exempted from bringing legal representatives of Vincent Mathews on record by an order dated 23.12.2010.

10.In support of the above case, the petitioner had filed documents to substantiate the rents were received only from the Vincent Mathews from the year 2003.The respondent denied that they were the sub tenant. On the other hand they claimed to be the tenant of the of the Petitioner.

11.By two separate orders both dated 29.7.2011, the Rent Controller passed the following orders:-

- i. Partly allowing the H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007 filed by t he petitioner. The respondents were ordered to be evicted under Section 10 (3)(a)(iii), while rejecting eviction of the respondent under the other provisions invoked by the petitioner;

ii. Allowing the H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 filed by the respondents. The respondents were directed to pay a sum of Rs.11,00,000/- as arrears of rent to the petitioner for the period between January, 2007 to July, 2011 in ; and

iii. the Rent Controller also directed the respondents to pay to the petitioner a further rent of Rs. 20,000/- per month as future rent payable by on or before 3rd of succeeding month.

12.The Rent Controller has not only ordered eviction of the respondent under Section 10(3)(a)(iii) in H.R.C.O.P No.26 of 2007 but has also at the same time ordered payment of future rent in H.R.C.O.P No.33 of 2007 of Rs.20,000/- per month.

13.Thus, there is an apparent contradiction as eviction and payment of future rent cannot go together.

14.In H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007, the Rent Controller concluded that for the period between July 2006 to January 2007, after adjusting the advance of Rs.1,40,000/- against arrears of Rs.1,20,000/- the respondents were in arrears of rent for the month of January 2007 and thereafter only.

15.The Rent Controller held that since the subsequent rent was refused by the petitioner, respondents cannot be construed as wilful defaulters in payment of rent. The calculation of the arrears of rent for 43 months appears to be incorrect.

16.While passing the above orders, the Rent Controller has concluded that the deceased Vincent Mathews who passed away during the pendency of the above proceedings was not a tenant of the petitioner in absence of any documentary evidence and that the respondents were his tenants.

17.In these proceedings, the respondents relied on documents issued by the Pondicherry Municipalities in Ex.X1 to X3 to show that the Revenue Authority were informed about the extension of lease between the petitioner and the respondents herein and a copy of lease agreement signed by the petitioner's aforesaid Power of Attorney which was marked in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007.

18.In their defence in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007, the respondents had relied upon the deposition of the officers from the Municipalities who tendered evidence to the effect that they had examined lease agreement signed between the Power of Attorney

holder of the petitioner and the second respondent herein as Chief Executive Officer of M.s.Object D' Arts.

19.While granting relief in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007, the Rent Controller relied on a letter written by the petitioner to his Power of Attorney vide letter dated 01.01.2007 stating that he and his wife were doing a research project in Science and Education in India and that the petitioner intended to settle in down in Pondicherry and therefore the demised property was required for their own occupation and that they do not any other property.

20.Aggrieved by the orders passed in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007 and H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007, both the petitioner (landlord) and the respondents (Tenants) filed R.C.A.Nos.41, 40 & 37 of 2011.

21.R.C.A.No.37 of 2011 was filed by the respondents (tenants) and R.C.A.No.41 of 2011 filed by the petitioner (landlord) against order dated 29.07.2007 in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007.

22.R.C.A.No.40 of 2011 filed by the petitioner against the order dated 29.07.2007 in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007.

23.The Rent Control Appellate Court disposed these appeals vide two separate Judgment and three separate decretal order dated 10.10.2013 in the respective appeals as detailed in the chart above.

24.Order passed in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 was reversed and R.C.A.No.40 of 2011 was allowed by way of remand. The petitioners have taken a stand that the Rent Control Appellate Court has no power to remand.

25.In R.C.A.No.40 of 2011, the Rent Control Appellate Court has concluded that the learned Rent Controller in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 failed to examine the petitioner's witness in accordance with Section 137 of the Indian Evidence Act and trial conducted by the learned Rent Controller was not in accordance with law. Therefore, the order passed by the Rent controller, Puducherry was held not sustainable in law and suffered from non-application of mind. The parties were directed to appear before the trial Court on 06.11.2013.

26.The Rent Control Appellate Court dismissed R.C.A.No.40 of 2011 filed by the petitioner and allowed R.C.A.No.37 of 2011 filed by the respondent.

27. Aggrieved by these orders, the petitioner has filed C.R.P.No.265 of 2014 against order passed in R.C.A.No.41 of 2011, C.R.P.No.729 of 2014 against order passed in R.C.A.No.37 of 2011 and C.R.P.No.730 of 2014 against order passed in R.C.A.No.40 of 2011.

28. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the Appellate Court has no power to remit the case back. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the reliance placed on Exhibit P 1 which is alias Lease cum Rental Agreement was unstamped and unregistered cannot be relied upon.

29. In this connection, the learned counsel for the petitioner relied upon the following decisions.

- i. **Jupudi Kesava Rao vs Pulavarthi Venkata Subbarao and Others**, 1971(1) SCC 545.
- ii. **State of Bihar vs Karam Chand Thapar & Brothers Limited**, 1962 (1) SCR 827: AIR 1962 SC 110.
- iii. **Suchitra Sebastian, Thomas Victor vs Micheal Arul**, 2009-5-L.W.829.
- iv. **C.Kuttappa Nair and Another vs S.S.A.Shahul Hameed and Others**, 1972-L.W.323.
- v. **A.Aubumani vs Kanthammal**, 2008 (4) CTC 812.

30.I have considered the arguments advanced by the learned counsels for petitioner and the respondents in respective C.R.Ps.

31.The scope of revision under Section 25 of the Pondicherry Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1969 is limited.

32.It is confined that is legality, properly and correctness of the order passed by the Rent Controller or Rent Control Appellate Court. While entertaining the revision against the order passed under the said Act, the Court has to merely consider the above aspect alone.

33.The Rent Control Appellate Court had framed following points for determination in R.C.A.No.37 and 41 of 2011:-

- i. Whether the petition filed under Section 10(2) (i), 10(2) (ii) (a) and 10(3) (a) (iii) of Pondicherry Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1969 is maintainable in law?
- ii. Whether the petitioner is entitled for an order of eviction on the ground of default in payment of rent under Section 10(2) (i) of the said Act?
- iii. Whether the petitioner is entitled for an order of eviction on the ground of sub lease under Section 10(2) (ii) (a) of the said Act?
- iv. Whether the petitioner is entitled for an order of eviction on the ground of personal occupation under Section 10(3) (a) (iii) of the said Act?
- v. Whether the order passed by the learned Rent Controller in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007 on 29.07.2011 is just and legal?

34.The Rent Controller in order dated 29.07.2007 in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 has noted Exhibit P 1 Lease cum Rental Agreement signed between the petitioner represented by his Power of Attorney Dr.Rajakumar Selvanathan with M/s.Objects D' Arts represented by the 1st respondent Mr.Vikneswaran Asokan as CEO.

35.The said Agreement has been witnessed by two persons namely A.N.Sanjeevee and Vincent Mathews/ the 1st respondent in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007 filed by the petitioner to evict the respondents.

36.It was held that there existed a relationship between the petitioner and the respondents herein as that of a landlord- tenant relationship in view of Exhibit P 1 Lease cum Rental Agreement in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 filed by the respondents herein.

37.However, in the appeal filed by the petitioner, in R.C.A.No.40 of 2011 against the order passed in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007, the Rent Control Appellate Court has observed that the Exhibit P1 Lease cum Rental Agreement was both unregistered and not duly stamped and since only photocopy of the said lease cum rental agreement was filed. Therefore it cannot be taken into consideration for deciding the issues in dispute and thus accepted

the contention of the petitioner that the Exhibit P 1- Lease cum Rental Agreement was inadmissible in law.

38.It was concluded that neither the Rent Controller recorded evidence by way of Chief examination by considering the affidavit of Power of Attorney namely Dr.Rajakumar Selvanathan nor gave a chance to the respondents herein (Petitioner in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007) to cross examine the said witness to find out the truth and therefore the learned Rent Controller failed to examine the respondent's witness in accordance with law.

39.Accordingly, it was concluded that the trial conducted by the Rent Controller in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 was not in accordance with law and therefore the order passed was not sustainable and suffered from non-application of mind and was liable to be set aside.

40.In R.C.A.No.40 of 2011 filed against the order passed by the Rent Controller in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 (in the proceedings filed under Section 8 of the Puducherry Rent Controller Act by the respondent), it was held that there was no proof, that a Lease cum Rental Agreement was signed between the petitioner represented by his Power of Attorney and the respondents under

Exhibit P1 Lease cum Rental Agreement deed as it was an unregistered and an under stamped document and there was no examination or RW-1 (Dr.Rajakumar Selvanathan) Power of Attorney holder of the petitioner.

41.However, in R.C.A.Nos.37 and 41 of 2011(arising out of the order dated 29.07.2011 in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007) it was held that the burden of proof was on the petitioner to prove that the 1st respondent in H.R.C.O.P.26 of 2007 (Vincent Mathews alias Vincent Mathias) was a tenant and since there was no jural relationship between the petitioner and the said Vincent Mathews, it was concluded that the respondents were the tenants of the petitioner.

42.Paragraph 17 of the order of the Rent Control Appellate Court in R.C.A.Nos.37 & 41 of 2011 reads as follows:-

Furthermore it is pleaded by the petitioner that in violation of the lease agreement, the first respondent sub let the demised premises to the 2nd and 3rd respondents. Therefore, the plea is that the lease agreement was executed in between the first respondent and the petitioner during February, 2003. The contention of the 2nd and 3rd respondent is the petitioner executed a lease agreement during 2003 in favour of the 3rd respondent and a photo copy of the lease agreement was parted with the 3rd respondent and a photo copy of the lease agreement was parted with the 3rd respondent. It is not the case

of the petitioner, the lease agreement to the demised premises is a registered document. In Ex.P3, Advocate notice dated 19.02.2007 addressed to the 1st respondent for non-residential purpose for a period of three years and the 1st respondent was paying rent up to June, 2006. Further in para two of the petition tenancy agreement is admitted. **Therefore, the existence of the lease agreement with respect to the demised premises is admitted and well proved.** The petitioner claims that the lease agreement was entered in between the first respondent and the petitioner, on the other hand the 2nd and 3rd respondents claim lease agreement was entered in between 3rd respondent and the petitioner with respect to the demised premises. Under such circumstances, burden is on the petitioner to produce the lease agreement to prove the landlord and tenant relationship between the first respondent and the petitioner. But the petitioner failed to do so. The contention of the 2nd and 3rd respondent is the petitioner and the 1st respondent colluded together, thereby, the first respondent initially remains exparte and after his demise, the petitioner taken steps from exemption him to implead the legal heir of 1st respondent to the proceedings. **As per the discussions made above, this court is of the view that there is valid substance* and acceptable materials in the arguments advance by the 2nd and 3rd respondents.**

(*typed as subsistence)

43. Again in paragraph 18, the Rent Control Appellate Court has concluded that the respondents herein were tenants of the petitioner. Relevant portion reads as follows:-

"Considering the evidence of R.W.2 and Ex.X4 and Ex.X6 documents, this court is of the view that the contention of the **2nd and 3rd respondents** (respondents herein) that they took the demised premises from the petitioner for lease is also acceptable one."

44.Thus, in different proceedings arising out of same cause of action, mutually incompatible reliefs was granted by the Rent Controller and a diametrically opposite conclusion was arrived by the Rent Control Appellate Court regarding existence of relationship between the petitioner and the respondents.

45.While the Rent Controller has allowed eviction under Section 10((3)(a) of the Act in H.R.C.O.P No.26 of 2007 but at the same time directed the respondent to pay rent at Rs.20,000/- per month from July, 2011 for successive period.

46.Therefore, the order passed by the Rent Controller in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 asking the respondent to pay future rent at Rs.20,000/- militated with the relief granted in H.R.C.O.P No.26 of 2007.

47.Similarly, the Rent Control Appellate Court while disposing

2007) has remitted the case back to the Rent Controller to determine the existence of landlord-tenant relationship between the petitioner.

48.However, while dismissing R.C.A.No.41 of 2011 (filed by the Petitioner) and allowing R.C.A. No.37 of 2011 (filed by the respondent) both of which arise out of the same order passed in H.R.C.O.P No.26 of 2007, the Rent Control Appellate Court while concluding that there was no landlord-tenant relationship between the petitioner and the said Vincent Mathews has tacitly accepted the respondents were the tenants of the petitioner but at the same time refused to answer rest of the point of determination in absence of production of original of Ex.P.1 (Lease Cum Rental Agreement) filed in H.R.O.C.P.No.33 of 2007 with the observation that though the petitioner has not questioned its execution has however questioned its admissibility and the facts remains that the respondents have admitted the existence of the said lease agreement.

49.If conclusion that the respondents are the tenants of the petitioner then there is no necessity to remand the case before the Rent Controller in H.R.C.O.P No.33 of 2007. If that be so, the Rent Control Appellate Court should have answered rest of the points for

determination as well.

50.The Rent Control Appellate Court has merely concluded that the respondents did not take any steps either to produce Exhibit P 1 marked in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 nor taken any steps to direct the petitioner to produce the original of the Lease cum Rental Agreement and has therefore concluded that since the Exhibit P1 Lease cum Rental Agreement marked in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 was not brought on record in R.C.A.Nos.37 & 41 of 2011, it cannot be considered.

51.After giving a finding that the respondents were the tenants of the petitioner, the Rent Controller failed to answer the rest of point for determination that were framed by him.

52.By setting aside the order passed in the eviction proceedings in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007 and leaving the issue open to be decided in the remand proceedings in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 has not furthered the justice, particularly when the respondent have not denied existence of landlord-tenants relationship with the petitioner.

53.I am therefore of the view that it was unnecessary for the

Rent Control Appellate Court to have remitted the case back in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 filed by the respondent when it is not denied that the respondents were tenants of the petitioner.

54.The plea relating to the own occupation under Section 10 (3) (a) (iii) of the Pondicherry Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1969 has not been discussed by the Rent Control Appellate Court, though, in the operative portion, the relief has been denied to the petitioner while allowing R.C.A No.37 of 2011 file by the respondent.

55.The respondents have also not denied that the petitioner is the owner of the property and that they were his tenants.

56.The petitioner has adduced the evidence before the Rent Controller that the property was required for own use as he intended to do a research project in Science and Education in India for a period of 4 year along with his wife and intended to settle down in Puducherry and that he had no other building or was in occupation of any other building in the commune.

57.The respondents have not brought out any contra evidence before the Rent Controller to substantiate that the petitioner had

any other property with him to disbelieve the plea of bonafide requirement under Section 10 (3) (a) (iii) of CPC of the petitioner.

58. Even otherwise, if eviction was ordered wrongly, the respondents have right to re-claim the possession of the rented premises by initiating appropriate proceedings under the Pondicherry Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1969.

59. The respondents are not remedyless under said Act if later it turns out that the eviction proceedings under Section 10 (3) (a) (a) (iii) of the Pondicherry Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1969 was a mere ruse/ploy to fetch higher rent from others instead of own occupation for *bonafide* purpose.

60. During the course of hearing, it was also submitted that the respondents has not been deposited the rent during the course of this proceedings.

61. Thus, it is clear that even though, the Rent Controller and the Rent Control Appellate Court have concluded that there was a jural relationship of landlord-tenants between the petitioner and the respondents herein, the respondents have not taken steps to

deposit the arrears of rent and the subsequent rent and have been in possession of the property by taking advantage of the present Civil Revision Petitions.

62.In my view, the respondents have overstayed on the property despite the fact that the petitioner has made out the case before the Rent Controller in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007 regarding their bonafide requirement under Section 10 (3) (a) (iii) of the Pondicherry Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1969.

63.The respondents are in arrears of rent all through the period and therefore cannot enjoy the possession of the property any longer. The respondents shall vacate the rented premises and deliver the possession to the petitioner within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

64.In the result,

- WEB COPY
- i. Order dated 29.07.2011 passed by the Rent Controller in H.R.C.O.P.No.26 of 2007 stands affirmed. Consequently, order dated 10.10.2013 passed by the Rent Control Appellate Court in R.C.A.No.37 of 2011 is set aside and the order dated 10.10.2013 in R.C.A.No.41 of 2011 stands

affirmed.

ii. The order dated 29.07.2011 passed by the Rent Controller in H.R.C.O.P.No.33 of 2007 is partly upheld and therefore the order dated 10.10.2013 passed in R.C.A.No.40 of 2011 is set aside. Respondents are directed to pay the arrears of rent to the petitioner for the entire period within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and also vacate the rented premises within such period.

iii. Consequently,

- a) C.R.P.(NPD).No.265 of 2014 stands disposed in view of the order in C.R.P.(NPD).No.729 of 2014;
- b) C.R.P.(NPD).No.729 of 2014 stands allowed; and
- c) C.R.P.(NPD).No.730 of 2014 stands partly allowed.
- d) No cost.

WEB COPY

25.07.2019

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
jen

C. SARAVANAN J.,

jen

To

- 1.The Principal District Court,
Puducherry.
- 2.The Section Officer,
V.R.Section, High Court, Madras.



Pre-Delivery common order
in

C.R.P.(NPD).Nos.265, 729
& 730 of 2014

WEB COPY

25.07.2019