

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.07.2019

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.MANIKUMAR
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD

W.P.No.20117 of 2019
and
W.M.P.No.19589 of 2019

T.N.Sakthivel @ Sivasakthivel .. Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.Government of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary,
Public Works Department,
Secretariat,
Chennai - 600009.
- 2.Tamil Nadu Water Supply & Drainage Board,
Rep. by its Secretary,
No.31, Kamarajar Salai,
Chepauk,
Chennai - 600005.
- 3.The Chief Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Water Supply & Drainage Board,
No.30, Bharathi Park Road,
Siruvani,
Coimbatore.
- 4.The Executive Engineer,
TWAD Board,
No.216, Arumuga Veedhi,
Thirunagar Colony,
Erode.
- 5.The District Collector,
Erode District,
Erode.

..Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to pass orders on the petitioner's representation dated 17.06.2019 within a stipulated period as fixed by this Hon'ble Court and forbear the respondents from putting up construction of the ring well at Kodiveri Dam in Kodiveri combined water supply scheme till then.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Gandhi, Senior Counsel
for Mr.S.Parthasarathy.

For R1 and R5 : Mr.E.Manoharan
Additional Government Pleader.

For R2 to R4 : Mr.R.Ganesh Babu

O R D E R

(Order of this Court was made by SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J.)

The District General Secretary of Hindu Munnani, has filed the instant public interest litigation, purportedly in the interest of general public of Thadapalli and Arakkankottai Villages, for a writ of mandamus, directing the respondents, to pass orders on the petitioner's representation dated 17.06.2019, within a stipulated period of time, as fixed by this Court and to forbear the respondents from constructing a ring well at Kodiveri Dam in Kodiveri Combined Water Supply Scheme.

2. The petitioner submits that for the purposes of irrigation from water in Bhavani River, a canal has been constructed, called Thadapalli, Arakkankottai Canal near Kodiveri Dam. It is stated that for the past 520 years, water is drawn from the said dam to the Canal for the benefit of nearby villages. The petitioner states that Thadapalli is about 77 kilometers away from the dam and Arakkankottai is about 32 kilometers away from the dam. The canal was constructed for the purposes of irrigating 25000 acres directly and 15000 acres indirectly.

3. The petitioner states that Canals are designed in a such way, water flowing from the Kodiveri Dam reaches Thadapalli and Arakkankottai canals and unutilised water goes back to the canal.

4. It is further stated that the respondents have brought out a scheme called "Kodiveri Combined Water Supply Scheme" and have started to dig a ring well, at the mouth of the Thadapalli canal.

5. The petitioner contends that, according to the Dam Protection Rules, no construction can be made at that place. It is necessary to point out that, the Dam Protection Act is only at the stage of bill and has yet not been passed by both the Houses. Petitioner states that the water which is discharged from Bhavani Sagar Reservoir flows into river Bhavani and reaches Kodiveri Dam from where, it is released into Thadapalli and Arakkankottai canals, for the purpose of irrigation. It is stated that if the scheme of constructing a ring well is implemented, there will be a severe water scarcity in the said areas. It is further stated that water meant for irrigation and for drinking, would be utilised for the factories. It is further stated that the scheme is against the interest of the people residing in abovesaid areas and it will also result in depletion of ground water level, because people who are depending upon the water from this Canal, would be deprived of water and would be forced to use ground water, for carrying on their activities.

6. It is stated in the writ petition that people in the area, are protesting for abandoning the scheme.

7. The State of Tamil Nadu have filed a typed set of papers, bringing on record the various government orders, permission letter accorded by the Public Works Department, report of the committee, constituted for considering the feasibility of having the ring well at the place where it is sought to be established, and to achieve the object, issuance of G.O.Ms.No.54, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 29.05.2018, regarding sanction of combined water supply scheme in Perundurai and 7 other Town Panchayats including 547 villages near wayside of Bhavani River.

8. Mr.R.Gandhi, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner, would contend that the construction of ring well at the place which is chosen, would cause serious danger to Kodiveri Dam. According to him, this aspect of the matter, has not been taken into account. He further states that substantial water is being diverted, which will result in reduction of water for agriculture and other purposes in Thadapalli and Arakkankottai villages.

9. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the materials available on record.

10. Government of Tamil Nadu by way of G.O.Ms.No.54, Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department, dated 29.05.2018, have brought out a combined water supply scheme in Perundurai and 7 other Town Panchayats including 547 wayside rural habitations in Erode and Tiruppur Districts with Bhavani River as the source. Paragraph No.8 of the said G.O., read as under:-

"8. The Government after careful examination of the proposal of the MD, Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board and the District Collector, Erode have decided to accord administrative sanction to take up the implementation of the "Combined Water Supply Scheme to Perundurai and 7 other Town Panchayats including 547 Rural Habitations in Erode and Tiruppur District with River Bhavani as Source" at an estimated cost of Rs.224.00 Crore (Rupees Two hundred and twenty four crore only) with the loan assistance from NABARD - RIDF XXIV 2018-19 / MNP and other sources by the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board and annual maintenance cost of Rs.5.91 crore (Rupees Five crore and ninety one lakh only) to be borne by Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board."

11. A Water Utilization Committee meeting was held on 06.07.2018 under the Chairmanship of the Principal Secretary to the Government, Public Works Department, wherein it was proposed to draw 17.23mld as an immediate requirement. The relevant portion of the decision taken in the said meeting, read as under:-

"7. Providing Combined Water Supply Scheme to Perundurai and 7 other Town Panchayats including 547 Rural Habitations in Erode and Tiruppur District.

In this scheme, it is proposed to draw 17.23 mld (3.79 mgd) of surface water from River Bhavani as immediate requirement. The details of the scheme were explained to the Committee. The Committee was informed that the Technical Sub Committee to the Water Utilisation Committee has recommended this scheme for the intermediate requirement of water. The Tamil Water Supply and Drainage Board officials requested the Committee to approve the ultimate drawal of 26.67 mld (5.87 mgd) for this scheme.

After brief discussions, the Committee unanimously approved this scheme for the drawal of intermediate requirement of water of 17.23 mld (3.79 mgd) subject to the condition that Recharging the Recycling of water are carried out by the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board. Further, the Committee decided that the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board can approach the Government for sanction of the ultimate requirement of water for this scheme at an appropriate time."

12. In pursuant to the meeting dated 06.07.2018, by the Water Utilization Committee, the Government of Tamil Nadu passed another G.O.(4D) No.4, Public Works (W2) Department, dated 15.02.2019, for Combined Water Supply Schemes, for drawal of water by Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board to Namakkal, Tirunelveli, Virudhunagar, Coimbatore, Thrissy, Kanyakumari, Erode, Tiruppur and Salem Districts, as recommended by the Technical Sub-Committee involving drawal of water of 1 MGD, approved by the Water Utilisation Committee. The relevant portion of the said G.O., read as under:-

GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU
ABSTRACT

Water Resources Department - Combined Water Supply Schemes - Drawal of water by Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board to Namakkal, Tirunelveli, Virudhunagar, Coimbatore, Trichy, Kanyakumari, Erode, Tiruppur and Salem Districts from Government Sources - Recommended by the Technical Sub-Committee involving drawal of water of 1 MGD and above - Approved by the Water Utilization Committee - Permission Granted - Orders - Issued.

Public Works (W2) Department

G.O. (4D) No.4

Dated: 15.02.2019

விளம்பி, மாசி 03,

திருவள்ளூர் ஆண்டு 2050

Read:

1. G.O.(Ms)No.700, Public Works Department, dated 18.10.1996.

2. G.O.(Ms).No.242, Public Works Department, dated 28.11.2006.

Read also:

3. From the Engineer-in-Chief, Water Resources Department and Chief Engineer (General), Public Works Department, Chennai Letter No.S7(4)/72908/OT-V/1996, dated 24.05.2018.

ORDER:

In his letter third read above, the Engineer-in-Chief, Water Resources Department and Chief Engineer (General), Public Works Department, Chennai has forwarded the proposal of water supply schemes, which were already approved in the 41st Technical Sub-Committee meeting and recommended to place before the Water Utilisation Committee involving drawal of water

of 1MGD (Million Gallon Per Day) and above from Government sources, for consideration and clearance.

2. Accordingly, the proposals were placed before the Water Utilisation Committee meeting held on 6.7.2018 under the Chairmanship of the Principal Secretary to Government, Public Works Department. The Committee has approved the following proposals as recommended by the Technical Sub Committee in its 41st meeting as detailed below:

Sl.No .	Water Supply Schemes	Decision of W U C
6	Providing Combined Water Supply Scheme to Perundurai and 7 other Town Panchayats including 547 Rural Habitations in Erode and Tiruppur Districts.	The Committee unanimously approved this scheme for the drawal of immediate requirement of water of 17.23 mld (3.79 mgd) subject to the condition that Recharging and Recycling of water are carried out by the TWAD Board. Further, the Committee decided that the TWAD Board can approach the Government for sanction of the ultimate requirement of water for this scheme at an appropriate time.

3. After careful examination, the Government have decided to accept the recommendations of the Water Utilization Committee. Accordingly, the Government permit the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board in Namakkal Tirunelveli, Virudhunagar, Coimbatore, Trichy, Kanyakumari, Erode, Tiruppur and Salem Districts to draw water from the respective sources, as indicated in para 2 above subject to the usual terms and conditions which are appended to this order as Annexure.

4. The Engineer-in-Chief, Water Resources Department, and Chief Engineer (General), Public Works Department, Chennai and respective Regional Chief Engineers are directed to permit the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board in Namakkal, Tirunelveli, Virudhunagar, Coimbatore, Trichy, Kanyakumari, Erode, Tiruppur and Salem Districts to draw the specified quantity of water from the specified places subject to the conditions stipulated in the usual terms and

conditions annexed to this order. Water charges shall be levied in accordance with the orders in force.

5. The Managing Director, Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board is directed to take into consideration the decision of the Water Utilization Committee while formulating the Water Supply Schemes in the Cauvery Basin.

(BY ORDER OF THE GOVERNOR)

S.K.PRABAKAR

PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

13. The said G.O. also enumerated conditions for drawal of water from Government sources by the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board, are extracted hereunder:-

Annexure of G.O.(4D) No.4, Public Works (W2)
Department, Dated 15.02.2019

Conditions for drawal of water from Government sources
by the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board

1. The Technical and Economical - viability of the scheme will be left to the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board (TWAD).
2. The present drawal should not affect the existing water supply to the nearby villages etc.
3. The construction of collection wells-cum-pump house should not obstruct the free flow of water in the river and the location should be decided in consultation with the Chief Engineer, Water Resources Department of the concerned Region.
4. The proposed tapping point for the present proposal should be 500 metre away from the abstractions area in the River near the existing collection wells, if any available for the water supply scheme.
5. No damages should be caused to the riverbanks during the process of laying pipelines across the river. If any damages are caused, it should be rectified by the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board, at their cost.
6. Free flow of water in the river should be ensured.
7. Laying of pipe lines should be done at least 1.5 m below the deepest bed level of the river.

8. Necessary protective works for the riverbanks on either side should be made where the pipelines cross the river.

9. The construction works in the river should be executed only in the presence of the field officers of Water Resources Department, Public Works Department.

10. The Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board, Municipality, Panchayats, etc., should not come up with any request for special release of water for recharging the bed of the river during non-flow season.

11. The Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board, Municipality, Panchayat, etc have to pay necessary royalty charges (fixed by the Government from time to time) for the industrial and commercial demands.

12. Measuring devices (water meter) must be provided by the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board to calculate the quantity of water drawn out of the above source. Approaches for checking the water meter must be provided by the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board.

13. The proposed drawal quantity of water should not be exceeded in future without the approval of the Water Utilisation Committee and the Government.

14. An agreement is to be executed by the Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage Board with Water Resources Department, Public Works Department, for drawal of water.

15. Concurrence of the District Collector should be obtained before commencement of the scheme.

16. Resolution of the local body should be obtained before commencement of the scheme.

17. Either side of the source point, a network of observation wells are to be fixed and monitored by Tamil Nadu Water Supply and Drainage and other water drawing agencies to know the impact on ground water level after a period of considerable time. If the drawal affects the existing irrigation well in normal monsoon, suitable recharge mechanism is to be suggested and implemented. Reserve fund, out of the total funds allocated for the scheme may be set aside at the time of getting the clearance. This will ensure

the availability of water, either surface or ground water on either side of the point.

S.K.PRABAKAR
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

14. Pursuant to the Government Orders, it was decided to have a baby well at Kodivery dam for drawal of water. A Farmer's Association of the area raised objections on 09.06.2019, stating that they had an apprehension that the structure would affect the flow in Thadapalli Canal. The District Collector, Erode District, issued a press release on 12.06.2019, stating that the flow in Thadapalli Canal would not be affected due to the construction of Baby Well. A peace Committee meeting was also held on 14.06.2019 at Gobichettipalayam Sub Collector's Office with the said Farmer's Association and Officials.

15. Pursuant to the Peace Committee meeting, a Committee was formed by the Managing Director, TWAD Board, Chennai, as requested the District Collector, Erode, to analyze the feasibility of relocation of the Baby Well constructed under Perundurai Combined Water Supply Scheme. A committee comprising of the Chief Engineer, TWAD Board, Coimbatore, Superintending Engineer, TWAD Board, Coimbatore-Nilgiris Circle, Coimbatore and Deputy Hydrogeologist, TWAD Board, Erode-Tiruppur-Karur Circle, Erode, was constituted to look into the issue.

16. The purposes of the committee was to analyse the feasibility of relocation of Baby Well constructed under Perundurai Combined Water Supply Scheme. The Committee members inspected the following 3 places, to see as to whether the Baby Well could be shifted or not,

- a) Kodivery Dam (Original Present Location)
- b) Mettukau Thottam (1.60 km upstream of Kodivery Dam)
- c) Pei Anai Area (5.50 km downstream of Kodivery Dam)

17. After inspection, the committee gave a report on the merits and demerits of the three locations as under:-

The merits and the demerits of the above three locations are presented below

Sl . No	Location of Head Works Arrangements	Merits	Demerits
I	Kodivery Dam (Original Present Location)	In respect of Source, this location is the best suitable priority location, since the Sustainability of Kodivery Source/Storage of Kodivery Dam and it will facilitate uninterrupted pumping of water during drought/lean period to the requirement exclusively allotted for water supply 1) The location of Baby well was fixed in consultation with the PWD authorities after having joint inspection in the upstream of Kodivery Dam. 2) The width of the Thadapalli Canal Sluice is 16m and the available width of water body near the Baby well site is 30m.so the flow of the River Bhavani would not be affected by Baby well. 3) Moreover the Baby well is located away from the entry point of Canal, a clear distance of 3.7m available between well and entry point of Canal. 4) After the completion of Baby well, the flow will pass on above the roof slab of the Baby well and 0.40 m below the normal flow level of River Bhavani and in submerged conditions. So there is no point of obstructions in the flow directing either to Thadapalli Canal or the Kodiveri Dam. 5) No Additional Financial expenditure would be involved.	The Apprehension from the Thadapalli Ayacut farmers stating that the Baby well structure would affect the flow into the Canal is the only issue in this regard and prevailing the Law and Order problems. If the Head works will be changed, loss of expenditure incurred on Baby well work and dam arrangements of Rs.26.35 Lakhs.

Sl No	Location of Head Works Arrangements	Merits	Demerits
II	Mettukau Thottam (1.60 km upstream of Kodivery Dam)	1. Alternate location as suggested by WRD, PWD to pacify Thadapalli ayacut farmers 2. In respect of Source, this location is in II nd Priority since it is located 1.6 Km upstream of Kodivery Dam. The diversion arrangements may be made during drought/lean period if necessary to get the required quantity of water 17.23 Mld.	1.The approach Pathway passes through Private Patta land to a length of 300 m, hence the process of land acquisition has to be taken up and it would lead additional time and delay in completion of Project. During the summer, the diversion arrangement may have to be made to get the required quantity of wter i.e., 17.23 MLD. 2. Due to change in Head works location, increase in length of Raw water Pumping Main of 1.10 km arises. 3. The cost of the Project increases to a value of Rs.1.40 Crores. Revised administrative sanction/G.O. is warranted and also Completion of project will be delayed very badly.

Sl . No	Location of Head Works Arrangements	Merits	Demerits
III	Pei Anai area (5.50 km downstream of Kodivery Dam)	1) Alternate location suggested by WRD, PWD to pacify Thadapalli canal ayacut farmers.	1) In respect of Source, this location is in III rd Priority; since it is located 5.5Km downstream of Kodivery Dam and the flow during lean/Drought periods is minimum comparing the location of Mettukadu Thottam. This could not be considered as a reliable source to yield 17.32 mld for this CWSS. 2) Additional Cost will be involved due to change in Headworks. The design of pumpset head increase since the Headworks site falls in lower level. The cost of the Project increases to a value of Rs.20 Lakhs. Revised administrative sanction/G.O. is warranted and also Completion of project will be delayed.

18. After considering all the aspects, it was found that the present place, that is Kodiveri Dam, is the best suitable location for the baby well for drawal of the designed quantity for this project. The work has already started. No material has been shown, as to how there is any danger to the Kodiveri Dam.

19. It is well settled that the Government is the best judge to decide, as to how the natural resources like water, should be utilised.

20. A perusal of the events, would indicate that the Government have considered the apprehension and objections, of all concerned, constituted committees to see the feasibility of relocation of the Baby Well. Courts cannot sit over policy decisions of the government for utilisation of the natural resources, unless the decision is completely arbitrary. Court cannot substitute the decision, once arrived at by the government, as an appellate authority.

21. It is well established that Courts do not frame policies and do not run government. In *Narmada Bachao Andolan Vs. Union of India and Others*, reported in {2000 (10) SCC - 664}, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as follows:-

"232. While protecting the rights of the people from being violated in any manner utmost care has to be taken that the Court does not transgress its jurisdiction. There is, in our constitutional framework a fairly clear demarcation of powers. The Court has come down heavily whenever the executive has sought to impinge upon the Court's jurisdiction.

233. At the same time, in exercise of its enormous power, the Court should not be called upon to or undertake governmental duties or functions. The Courts cannot run the Government nor can the administration indulge in abuse or non-use of power and get away with it. The essence of judicial review is a constitutional fundamental. The role of the higher judiciary under values of the Constitution and the rights of Indians. The Courts must therefore, act within their judicially permissible limitations to uphold the rule of law and harness their power in public interest. It is precisely for this reason that it has been consistently held by this Court that in matters of policy the Court will not interfere. When there is a valid law requiring the Government to act in a particular manner the Court ought not to, without striking down the law, give any direction which is not in accordance with law. In other words, the Court itself is not above the law.

234. In respect of public projects and policies which are initiated by the Government the Courts should not become an approval authority. Normally such decisions are taken

by the Government after due care and consideration. In a democracy welfare of the people at large, and not merely of a small section of the society, has to be the concern of a responsible Government. If a considered policy decision has been taken, which is not in conflict with any law or is not mala fide, it will not be in public interest to require the Court to go into and investigate those areas which are the function of the executive. For any project which is approved after due deliberation, the Court should not refrain from being asked to review the decision just because a petitioner in filing a PIL alleges that such a decision should not have been taken because an opposite view against the undertaking of the project, which view may have been considered by the Government is possible. When two or more options or views are possible and after considering them the Government takes a policy decision it is then not the function of the Court to go into the matter afresh and, in a way, sit in appeal over such a policy decision."

The above mentioned observations have been quoted with approval by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in BALCO EMPLOYEES' UNION (REGD) Vs. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS {2002 (2) SCC - 333}. In DIVISIONAL MANAGER, ARAVALI GOLF CLUB AND ANOTHER {2008 (1) SCC - 683}, in paragraphs Nos.17, 19, 20 and 22, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held thus:-

"17. Before parting with this case, we would like to make some observations about the limits of the powers of the judiciary. We are compelled to make these observations because we are repeatedly coming across cases where judges are unjustifiably trying to perform executive or legislative functions. In our opinion this is clearly unconstitutional. In the name of judicial activism judges cannot cross their limits and try to take over functions which belong to another organ of the State.

19. Under our Constitution, the legislature, the executive and the judiciary all have their own broad spheres of operation. Ordinarily, it is not proper for any of these three organs of the State to encroach upon the domain of another, otherwise the delicate balance in the Constitution will be upset, and there will be a reaction.

20. Judges must know their limits and must not try to run the Government. They must have modesty and humility, and not behave like emperors. There is broad separation of powers under the Constitution and each organ of the State - the legislature, the executive and the judiciary - must have respect for the other and must not encroach into each other's domains.

22. In *Tata Cellular Vs. Union of India* (vide AIR para 113 : SCC para 94), this Court observed that the modern trend points to judicial restraint in administrative action. The same view has been taken in a large number of other decisions also, but it is unfortunate that many Courts are not following these decisions and are trying to perform legislative or executive functions. In our opinion adjudication must be done within the system of historically validated restraints and conscious minimisation of the Judges' preferences. The Court must not embarrass the administrative authorities and must realise that administrative authorities have expertise in the field of administration while the Court does not. In the words of Neely VJ (SCC p.681, para 82).

"82.... I have very few illusions about my own limitations as a Judge ... I am not an accountant, electrical engineer, financier, banker, expect Judges intelligently to review a 5000 page record addressing the intricacies of a public utility operation."

It is not the function of a Judge to act as a superboard, or with the zeal of a pedantic schoolmaster substituting its judgment for that of the administrator."

In *COMMON CAUSE (A REGD. SOCIETY) VS. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS*, {2008 (5) SCC - 511}, at paragraph No.40, the Hon'ble Supreme Court, held thus:-

"The justification given for judicial activism is that the executive and legislature have failed in performing their functions. Even if this allegations is true, does it justify the judiciary in taking over the functions of the legislature or executive? In our opinion it does not: firstly, because that would be in violation of the high constitutional principle of separation of powers between the three organs of the State, and secondly, because the judiciary has neither

the expertise nor the resources for this. If the legislature or executive are not functioning properly it is for the people to correct the defects by exercising their franchise properly in the next elections and voting for candidates who will fulfil their expectations, or by other lawful means e.g., peaceful demonstrations and agitations, but the remedy is surely not by the judiciary in taking over the functions of the other organs."

22. In view of the fact that construction work has already started, no useful purpose would be served by asking the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner. In any event, objections of the public and farmers, have been considered and it has been found that it is not feasible to shift the Baby Well, to any other place. There is no merit in this writ petition.

23. In view of the above, writ petition is dismissed. No Costs. Consequently, the connected writ miscellaneous petition, is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CO)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

dm

To

- 1.The Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Public Works Department,
Secretariat, Chennai - 600009.
- 2.The Secretary,
Tamil Nadu Water Supply & Drainage Board,
No.31, Kamarajar Salai,
Chepauk, Chennai - 600005.
- 3.The Chief Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Water Supply & Drainage Board,
No.30, Bharathi Park Road,
Siruvani, Coimbatore.
- 4.The Executive Engineer,
TWAD Board,
No.216, Arumuga Veedhi,
Thirunagar Colony, Erode.

5.The District Collector,
Erode District,
Erode.

+1cc to Mr.R.Ganeshbabu, Advocate, S.R.No.61694
+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.62078
+1cc to Mr.S.Parthasarathy, S.R.No.61719

W.P.No.20117 of 2019
and
W.M.P.No.19589 of 2019

SSD (CO)

RRS (21/08/2019)



WEB COPY