

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.09.2019

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE G.JAYACHANDRAN

W.P.No.18870 of 2019
and W.M.P.No.18239 of 2019

Hajee Mohamed

... Petitioner

Versus

1.The Commissioner,
Greater Chennai Corporation,
Rippon Building,
Chennai-600 003.

2.Mr.Suresh Kumar (ARO)
Zone-5, Greater Chennai Corporation,
Rippon Building,
Chennai-3.

Respondents

...

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issue of Writ of Mandamus, directing the Respondent the Respondent to conduct enquiry on the basis of the petitioner's representation dated 28.06.2019 regarding undue interference caused by the A.R.O of the Zone-5 into the business of the petitioner and conclude the same within a time frame limit.

For Petitioner: Mr.C.V.Kumar

For R1 : Mrs.Karthika Ashok
Standing Counsel (Corporation)

For R2 : No Appearance

O R D E R

The allegation of the petitioner, in this writ petition is that one Mr.Suresh Kumar (ARO) Zone-5, Greater Chennai Corporation, is frequently causing trouble to him. Since, the allegation was serious in nature, the petitioner sought for a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents to conduct enquiry based on his representation dated 28.06.2019 in respect of the allegations mentioned therein.

2. This Court directed the learned standing counsel for the first respondent to take instruction from the first respondent. It is reported by the learned Standing Counsel for the first respondent / Chennai (Corporation) that there are disputes between the petitioner and the landlord. In this regard, a complaint was given by the landlord about some activities of the petitioner which are not permitted under law. Therefore, in order to verify the allegation made in the complaint made by the landlord, the second respondent inspected the premises of the petitioner and found that in the said premises illegal activities carried on by the petitioner.

3. On hearing the submissions made by the learned Standing Counsel for the first respondent, this Court finds that the writ petition does not carry any merit for consideration and the second respondent / officer duly authorized to inspect the premises cannot be restrained from discharging his duty based on the petitioner vague allegation made in the petition unless, there is material to entertain in this case.

4. There is no material to entertain the representation of the petitioner dated 28.06.2019. Contrarily, the second respondent has inspected the premises of the petitioner, based on the complaint given by the landlord. Hence, this writ petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

gbi

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1.The Commissioner,
Greater Chennai Corporation,
Rippon Building,
Chennai-600 003.

+1cc to Mrs.Karthika Ashok, Advocate, SR.No.78842

W.P.No.18870 of 2019
and W.M.P.No.18239 of 2019

Kak(15/10/2019)