

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : **13.09.2019**

Pronounced on : **24.10.2019**

Coram

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **R.SURESH KUMAR**

C.R.P (PD) No.2817 of 2019
and C.M.P.No.18491 of 2019

1. Society of Sisters of the Presentation of the
Blessed Virgin Mary, Society No.2,
Rep. by its Secretary, Anna Salai, Thousand Lights,
Chennai - 600 006.
2. Rev. Sr. Grace Chacko
Vice-President-cum-mother Superior
residing at Church Park
No.184 and 218/1, Anna Salai,
Thousand Lights, Chennai - 600 006. .. Petitioners / Defendants

VS.

M/s. Jude's Infra Technologies Pvt., Ltd.,
(Formerly Judie Constructions Pvt., Ltd.,)
Rep. by its Managing Director,
Mr.H.J.Jude Aruldoss, having office at
TNBC Building, No.45/22, Santhome High Road,
Santhome, Mylapore, Chennai - 600 004. .. Respondent / Plaintiff

Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, as
against the order, dated 05.08.2019 made in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in
O.S.No.2204 of 2019 on the file of the XVII Additional City Civil Court,
Chennai.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Wilson

For Respondent : Mr.T.V.Ramanujam, Senior counsel
for Mr.S.Prem Auxilian Raj

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed against the fair and decretal order passed by the XVII Additional City Civil Court, Chennai in I.A.No.1 of 2019 in O.S.No.2204 of 2019 by order, dated 05.08.2019.

2. The necessary facts which are required to be noticed for the disposal of this Civil Revision Petition are as follows :

(i) That the Civil Revision Petitioners are the defendants in the suit and the respondent herein is the plaintiff. The parties are called as per the array of parties in the suit itself.

(ii) The first defendant is a society and their main object is to conduct the educational institutions, accordingly, they run a Matriculation School called Sacred Heart Matriculation School, situated at Church Park School campus at Anna Salai, Chennai. The second defendant is the Vice President-cum-mother superior of the first defendant.

(iii) The plaintiff is a private limited company, which was formally known as M/s. Judie Constructions Pvt., Ltd., subsequently renamed as M/s. Jude's Infra Technologies Pvt., Ltd., represented by its Managing Director. The plaintiff company has been in the field of construction for more than 40 years and have built number of schools, colleges and churches both in India and abroad.

(iv) In the school run by the first defendant, namely the Sacred Heart Matriculation School, there are 2047 students studying from LKG to XII Standard and in order to provide rest rooms as an additional facility for those students, the defendants decided to construct a toilet block separately consisting of ground and first floor.

(v) Accordingly, a construction agreement had been entered into between the defendants and the plaintiff on 10.10.2017 and on that date itself, the construction site had been handed over to the plaintiff.

WEB COPY

(vi) Among various clauses of the construction agreement, the relevant clauses, according to the defendants as well as the plaintiff are that, the contractor should obtain the building permit,

electrical board connection and all the approvals required for construction. All structural work should be carried out as per the drawing provided by structural consultant. All the electrical and plumbing work has to be carried out as per the drawing provided by the electrical and plumbing consultant.

(vii) The duration of the construction, according to Clause 4 of the agreement, was four months from the date of commencement.

(viii) Accordingly, construction had been made by the plaintiff and even though, as per the agreement, a total sum of Rs.86,32,000/- had been fixed excluding applicable taxes for construction cost, a sum of Rupees one Crore had been paid as advance by the defendants to the plaintiff. After the completion of the construction, the toilet block, i.e., the building in question had been handed over to the defendants on 03.06.2018. Thereafter the plaintiff seems to have made a claim for the remaining payment as the cost of construction, according to the plaintiff, had gone to a total sum of Rs.1,21,52,150/- + 18% tax, i.e., Rs.21,87,387/-, therefore the grand total was Rs.1,43,39,537/-, out of which since Rupees one Crore was paid as advance the net balance, according to the plaintiff, payable by the defendants was Rs.43,39,537/-.

(ix) In the meanwhile, the building in question handed over by the plaintiff to the defendants in first week of June 2018 had been put to use for the students. However, according to the defendants, they found that, there are lot of defects in the building. Some of the notable defects, according to the defendants, are that

- (a) There is accumulation of water outside the middle entrance of the building.
- (b) The ceiling on the left hand side of the building on the first floor is always found to be moist.
- (c) Water from the overhead tank gets drained out even when toilets are not in use.
- (d) Many of the toilet doors have gaps like it happens when wood contracts.
- (e) The flush of the toilets were not functioning.
- (f) Water was leaking on the walls and the floors.
- (g) The walls were always found to be a damp condition.

(x) Probably for these reasons, the defendants had not paid the balance cost of the construction with tax claimed by the plaintiff, therefore the plaintiff filed a suit in C.S.No.877 of 2018, which is a money suit for a recovery of money to the extent of Rs.43,39,537/- with interest from the defendants.

(xi) The said suit though had been laid before this Court on Original side, it subsequently was transferred due to enhancement of pecuniary jurisdiction of the lower Courts, to the XVII Additional City Civil Court, where it was re-numbered as O.S.No.2204 of 2019.

(xii) In the said transferred suit, the I.A., i.e., A.No.10087 of 2018 filed in the Civil Suit before this Court also got transferred, which has got re-numbered as I.A.No.1 of 2019, where the plaintiff sought for a prayer for appointment of an Advocate Commissioner to inspect the toilet block built by the plaintiff and note down all the existing physical features and file a detailed report with the help of a Chartered Engineer pending the Suit.

(xiii) In the said Interlocutory Application, counter affidavit had been filed by the defendants. After having heard both parties, the learned Judge has disposed the said I.A.No.1 of 2019 through the impugned order, dated 05.08.2019, whereby the learned Judge had appointed an Advocate Commissioner to inspect the toilet block of the defendants School and note down the existing physical features and file a detailed report on all aspects including the structural stability of the said toilet with the help of the Superintending Engineer of the territorial circle from the Public Works Department / authority.

(xiv) Aggrieved over the said order passed by the Court below, especially in the context of appointing an Advocate Commissioner to note down the physical feature with the help of a Superintending Engineer from Public Works Department, the defendants have filed the present Revision.

3. I have heard Mr.S.Wilson, learned counsel appearing for the defendants, who are the revision petitioners herein, who would submit that, in so far as the Interlocutory Application seeking appointment of Advocate Commissioner before the Court below is concerned, the stand of the defendants, as the same has been reflected in the counter affidavit filed by the second defendant on behalf of the first defendant also in the Interlocutory Application that, there has been a number of defects, structural wise of the toilet block constructed for the defendants School by the plaintiff and with the result, the defendants had to get a opinion, i.e., structural stability assessment from some reputed structural Engineers / companies, where it was shockingly claimed to have been stated that, the toilet block was not structurally sound and more over since there have been number of defects as water leaking, with the result slippery floors, the building, i.e., toilet block could not be in a position to use, that too by girl students from

LKG to XII standard of the school concerned and therefore the toilet block in question had in fact been kept closed under lock and key and temporary barricade has been put up by the school management, i.e., the defendants not allowing any one to use the toilet block.

4. Therefore the learned counsel appearing for the defendants would submit that, by mere appointment of an Advocate Commissioner along with the Superintending Engineer of Public Works Department would not serve the purpose, as the building in question, i.e., the toilet block, requires a re-assessment from the point of view of the structural stability as well as other aspects and therefore in this context, it was the specific case of the defendants before the Court below that, the services of IIT, Madras or CSIR - SERC (Council of Scientific & Industrial Research - Structural Engineering Research Centre), Chennai has to be availed. The learned counsel would further submit that, in fact, before the Court below, it was the stand of the defendants, which is reflected at para 28 of the counter affidavit and also argued by the learned counsel appeared before the lower Court for the defendants that, the Engineers from IIT, Madras or SERC may be appointed to find out the structural stability and soundness of the building.

5. However, according to the learned counsel for the defendants, the Court below has understood the stand taken by the defendants that, as if the defendants had no objection in appointing an Advocate Commissioner along with the Chartered Engineer to note down the physical feature including structural stability and to file a report.

6. Therefore according to the learned counsel, the only grievance of the defendants before this Court in this revision is that, in order to find out the structural stability of the toilet block constructed on various aspects, in the light of the opinion given by at least 2 such structural Engineers that, the building structure is weak and cannot be put to use that too by students, it is not a mere payment of money as claimed by the plaintiff, but it is the precious life of thousands of students as even a small iota of risk cannot be taken by the school management in using the toilet block in question and therefore to have a permanent solution on those aspects, it become inevitable to avail the services of reputed institutions like IIT, Madras or CSIR-SERC.

7. I have heard Mr.T.V.Ramanujam, learned Senior counsel assisted by Mr.Prem Auxilian Raj for the plaintiff, who is the respondent herein, who would submit that, the defendants did not

raise any objection in appointment of Advocate Commissioner as per the averment in para 28 of the counter affidavit and this has been specifically taken note of by the Court below. He would further submit that, the lower Court was not stopping with that and it has taken pain to go into the details of who shall be the Chartered Engineer to be appointed along with the Advocate Commissioner to find out the structural stability of the building in question and in this regard, the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Public Buildings (Licensing) Act, 1965 (herein after referred to as "Licensing Act") has been pressed into service by the learned Judge and accordingly, along with the Advocate Commissioner, a Superintending Engineer of the Public Works Department was also directed to be taken for help to assess the structural stability of the building and other physical features of the building in question and to file a report.

8. Therefore the learned Senior counsel would submit that, the defendants cannot have any grievance over such appointment of an Advocate Commissioner along with the Superintending Engineer for the said purpose and only in order to defeat the lawful claim of the plaintiff for recovery of money, for which the main suit has been filed, the present revision has been filed by the defendants, he contended.

9. The learned Senior counsel in this regard has taken this Court to certain provisions of the Licensing Act, especially Section 2(8), i.e., definition for "public building", Section 4(4), i.e., enabling provision for making application with structural stability certificate and also the table under Rule 11 framed under the said Licensing Act to identify as to who shall be the Engineer to give certification for the building depending upon its worth.

10. Relying upon these provisions, the learned Senior counsel would submit that, if the school building is a public building, within the meaning of Section 2(8) of the Licensing Act, for use of such public building, license under the said Act is a must and in order to get the same, application has to be made in prescribed format under Section 4. When application is made, the structural stability certificate to be issued by the Chartered Engineer is to be annexed and in respect of issuance of such structural stability certificate, who shall be the competent Engineer to be engaged, has also been enumerated in the table provided under Rule 11 under the Licensing Act and as per Rule 11 table, the building with the cost of more than Rs.50 lakhs to be inspected and certified only by a Class IA Engineer and therefore, based on all these provisions only, the learned Judge has passed the

11/30

impugned order appointing an Advocate Commissioner with a direction to note down the existing physical feature and file a detailed report on all aspects including the structural stability of the toilet block with the help of a Superintending Engineer of the territorial circle from the Public Works Department / authority. Therefore the learned Senior counsel would submit that, absolutely there is no scope for interference in the said order, as it is a very reasoned order taking note of the fact and taking into account the concern of both sides and accordingly the said order was passed, hence, the revision is a futile exercise made by the defendants only in order to delay the process of completing the suit before the Court below to recover the money and therefore this Revision is liable to be dismissed, the learned Senior counsel contended.

11. I have considered the said submissions made by the learned counsel appearing for the defendants as well as the learned Senior counsel appearing for the plaintiff and also perused the materials placed before this Court.

12. The issue raised in the present Revision is in very narrow campus. As has been submitted by both sides through the respective

learned counsel that, the main suit is for recovery of money, wherein a Interlocutory Application, i.e., I.A.No.1 of 2019 has been filed for appointment of an Advocate Commissioner along with the Chartered Engineer to note down the physical feature of toilet block in question and to file a report with the help of the Chartered Engineer as to assess whether the claim and counter claim made with regard to the condition and stability of the toilet block in question and accordingly to decide the claim made by the plaintiff for recovery of money against the defendants in the suit.

13. In respect of those aspect, this Court need not traverse or ponder into, as those issues raised in the main suit is a matter for trial by the parties before the Court below.

14. In so far as the present order of appointment of Advocate Commissioner along with Chartered Engineer is concerned, I have gone through the impugned order, where the learned Judge, after having taken note of the stand taken by both sides as averred in the affidavit filed in support of the Interlocutory Application as well as the counter affidavit filed by the defendants, has concluded that, as both parties were agreeing for appointment of a qualified Engineer, without

going into other aspects of the case, at that juncture, the Court deems it fit that a Superintending Engineer of the territorial circle from the PWD authority would be the fittest person to accompany the Advocate Commissioner, as he is also qualified to issue the Structural Stability Certificate, as per the said Act (Licensing Act). Therefore it become clear that, the learned Judge allowed the said Interlocutory Application and appointed an Advocate Commissioner along with the Superintending Engineer to verify the structural soundness of the building and to file a report to that effect, only on the context that both parties agreed upon for such an appointment.

15. However it is to be noted that, the defendants who are the respondents in the Interlocutory Application, in their counter affidavit filed before the Court below, have made it clear that, when the toilet block was handed over for use to the defendants on 03.06.2018 and put to use, they found lot of defects which has been mentioned already and therefore according to the defendants, they had to get the structural stability certificate from a qualified Engineer, who, after having inspected the building, had given a certificate.

16. In this context, the structural stability assessment given by IGWETT Consultants, dated 27.09.2018, has given the following inference :

"The floor is already leaking because of faulty construction. Both foundation and columns are inadequate. As per Clause 9.1.1 and 9.3 IS 456:2000 only design mix shall be used for concrete of Grades M20 and above. (After analysing cement, jelly and sand to be used in laboratory). But only nominal mix (based on volume) is used at site for M30 concrete. No beams are provided below the cross walls in the toilet sections in First floor. Hence the slab is liable to crack due to the additional load of filling and the walls."

17. Like that, one R.Ramson Associates, Architects & Engineers has given a Stability Report, dated 25.10.2018, which reads thus :

"The building was inspected. It is a ground plus one toilet block. Toilets are constructed in both ground and first floor. Regarding first floor, the slabs must be sunken for accommodating pipes and closets. But floor is not sunken at site. Partition walls are built with 4.5" wall at closer interval. There are no beams provided to

support these partition walls. Hence the slab is subject to strip load and point load. Because of the filling in slab to accommodate plumbing pipes and closets the load coming on the slab is increased. On perusal of the structural drawing it is found that the slab is not strengthened to take this additional load from filling and strip load from partition walls. Hence it is liable to fail. It is also found that there are leakages in the building. The access to the terrace is not planned properly. Plastering in the walls are not done properly. Apron around the building is not done properly."

18. On getting these reports, the defendants, since they are not having any knowledge or expertise on civil construction, had been in a position to depend an expert body to verify completely the structural soundness and stability of the building in view of the defects pointed out by the said two reports, as to whether the toilet block in question can again be put to use for the students, for which what are all the rectification or remedial measures to be taken in a large scale as a permanent measure, had also to be assessed.

19. Only in that context at para 28 of the counter, the defendants have stated the following :

"With regard to the averments contained in paragraph No.19 are concerned, with regard to the appointment of Chartered Engineer is concerned, it is submitted that the respondents are willing to take such report from person to be appointed by this Hon'ble Court. The respondents submit that for the safety of the students and to find out the reality of the averments made in the Application, it is submitted that the Engineers from IIT, Madras or SERC may be appointed to find out the structural stability and soundness of the building. The above application has filed is purely an abuse of process of law."

20. In so far as appointment of Advocate Commissioner is concerned, the defendants also may not have any serious objection, but the Advocate Commissioner, being an officer of the Court, can only accompany with the qualified person and such qualified person alone, after having inspected the building thoroughly, has to give a report on structural soundness and stability of the building concerned and only based on such report to be given by the qualified person or an expert

in the field, the Advocate Commissioner can file a report. Therefore the stand of the defendants before the Court below, as averred in para 28 of the counter was that, in order to find out the reality for the purpose of the safety for the students, they submitted that, the Engineers from IIT, Madras or SERC may be appointed to find out the structural stability and soundness of the building.

21.However in the order impugned, the learned Judge has taken the view that, the defendants have accepted to appointment of a qualified Engineer and accordingly the Superintending Engineer of the territorial circle from PWD will be the fittest person and therefore he was appointed.

22. In this context, the only request on the part of the defendants before the Court below was that, since the magnitude of the alleged structural instability of the building is concerned, as per the structural stability assessment as well as the stability report submitted by two such technical concerns referred to above, unless a thorough report from a well reputed expert body in this regard is able to be obtained, the real picture would not come into light, whereby the chance of making proper rectification and remedial measure on

permanent basis enabling the defendants to put the building / toilet block in use for students, may not be a near possibility. Only in that context, they had been very particular to avail the services of the IIT Madras or CSIR-SERC.

23. In this context, it is to be noted that, the CSIR-SERC, Chennai is one of the National Laboratories in India under the control of CSIR. It is a pioneering Research Institute in structural Engineering field and the following has been given about them as an introduction or prelude :

"CSIR-Structural Engineering Research Centre (CSIR-SERC), Chennai, India is one of the national laboratories under the Council of Scientific & Industrial Research (CSIR), India. CSIR-SERC has built up excellent facilities and expertise for the analysis, design and testing of structures and structural components. Services of CSIR-SERC are being extensively used by the Central and State Governments and public and private sector undertakings. Scientists of CSIR-SERC serve on many national and international committees and the Centre is recognised at the national and international levels as a leading research institution in the

field of structural engineering. CSIR-SERC has been certified as ISO 9001:2005 quality institution."

24. Like that, the IIT, Madras is also one of the nation wide reputed institution and that is the reason why, the defendants had taken a definite stand before the Court below that, either the services of CSIR-SERC or the IIT, Madras in this regard has to be availed and a technocrat on structural stability and research to be deputed by either of these institutions can be appointed along with the Advocate Commissioner to verify and assess the structural stability of the toilet block and to file a report.

25. However the Court below by merely relying upon the provisions of the Licensing Act has come to a conclusion that, the Superintending Engineer of PWD will be the fittest person to be appointed in this regard.

26. In this context, it was the vehement contention on the part of the learned Senior counsel appearing for the plaintiff that, under Section 2(8) of the Licensing Act, the word "public building" includes

building used for school and colleges and if at all any public building has to obtain license under Section 4 of the Act, application has to be made, as per section 4(4) an application to be made under sub-section (1) & (2), may be accompanied by a certificate of structural soundness in the prescribed form obtained from an Engineer and the Engineer by whom such stability certificate has to be issued has also been mentioned in the table under Rule 11, where for category class IA, which relates to the building cost about Rs.50 lakhs and above, an Engineer of class IA category shall be the Engineer to give such certificate.

27. In order to appreciate the same, the relevant portion of the table under Rule 11 is extracted hereunder :

Class IA	Buildings the cost of which exceeds Rs.50.00 lakhs.	An Engineer with a degree in Civil Engineering of Indian or Foreign University or a Corporate Member of the Institution of Engineers (India) or recognised Professional Association abroad, as specified in item (2) above, with not less than fifteen years experience in building construction or with a Post Graduate Degree with not less than five years experience in building construction.
----------	---	--

28. From the reading of the said class IA category of Rule 11, it became clear that, an Engineer with a degree in Civil Engineering with not less than 15 years experience in building construction or with a Post Graduate degree with not less than 5 years experience in building construction can be a qualified Engineer to issue such structural stability certificate for a building with cost of more than Rs.50 lakhs.

29. If this is the mandate of the said provisions of the Act as well as the Rules made thereunder, one cannot find out that, the Superintending Engineer of PWD of that rank cannot be the qualified Engineer to issue such certificate.

30. No doubt the Superintending Engineer of PWD may be the qualified Engineer under the said Licensing Act to issue stability certificate of public building of worth about more than Rs.50 lakhs. The competence of such Engineer cannot be doubted by this Court.

31. However here in the case in hand, in a peculiar circumstances, the toilet block in question has been built separately as a massive building for worth about more than a crore of Rupee only as a toilet block for the massive usage of more than 2000 girl students studying in the school.

32. When the building in question is only a toilet block and it is not meant for any other use, in respect of all aspects, whether the said toilet block building is fit enough and structurally sound is the concern and in this context, the defendants were able to get some shocking reports, i.e., structural stability assessment as well as stability report from two such concern for whom they referred the matter, who after having inspected the building has given such a shocking report.

33. Though this Court is not having any expertise to express any opinion on those assessment and report, on mere perusal of the said reports would suggest that, in one of the report it says " The floor is already leaking because of faulty construction, both foundation and columns are inadequate". Another report says "There are no beams provided to support these partition walls. On perusal of the structural drawing, it is found that the slab is not strengthened to take the additional load from filling and strip load from partition walls. Hence it is liable to fail. It is also found that there are leakages in the building. The access to the terrace is not planned properly".

34. These comments made in the stability assessment as well as the stability report given by two such experts in the field would cause

definitely concern over the issue and only in that context, the defendants wanted to have a thorough inspection and a finding from the best available expert body in the city. Accordingly they sought for appointment of an expert either from IIT, Madras or from SERC of CSIR.

35. This has been infact specifically mentioned at para 28 of the counter affidavit, however the learned Judge has not taken note of the said aspect and she has proceeded to say as if that, the defendants accepted to appoint an Advocate Commissioner with any qualified Engineer and accordingly the learned Judge appointed Superintending Engineer of PWD as a fittest person to accompany the Advocate Commissioner to file a report.

36. On perusal of all these materials, it undisputedly discloses that, on the structural soundness and stability of the toilet block is concerned, there has been divergent opinion and in this context, in order to instil the confidence on the defendants, who are the management of the large school, that too a girl school in the vicinity of the Heart of the city, as to how the remedial measures to strengthen the stability soundness of the building can be made and by whom. As it

is not a mere issue of payment of some money to the contractor, i.e., the plaintiff but also it is a great concern that 100% safety of thousands of girl students from LKG to XII standard studying in the school of the defendants are to be ensured as no iota of doubt shall be permitted to prevail in the minds of the defendants and therefore in order to have the complete confidence, they needed the best services in this field to be availed.

37. It does not mean that, the Superintending Engineer of the PWD is an incompetent person but at the same time in order to instil the confidence on both sides, this Court feels that, apart from the Superintending Engineer of PWD, the services of CSIR-SERC, Chennai, can also be availed by the Advocate Commissioner, who shall take the Superintending Engineer, PWD to be identified in this regard along with the structural stability Engineering expert to be deputed by the CSIR-SERC, Chennai and complete the task as directed by the Court below and file a report to that effect, which would be the opt and amicable solution to meet the ends of justice.

38. In that view of the matter, this Court is inclined to dispose this Civil Revision Petition with the following orders :

That the order impugned is hereby modified to the following extent :

(a) that the Advocate Commissioner so appointed through the impugned order, apart from the Superintending Engineer of PWD to be identified for the task as directed by the Court below, shall also avail the services of CSIR-SERC, i.e., Structural Engineering Research Centre, Chennai under the aegis of Council of Scientific & Industrial Research, by making a request to the said organisation, i.e., CSIR-SERC, Chennai in writing along with the copy of this order to depute a senior expert in the field of structural Engineering from that institute, who shall also, along with the Advocate Commissioner shall inspect the building, i.e., the toilet block constructed at Church Park, Door No.184 & 218/1, Anna Salai, Thousand Lights, Chennai - 600 006 and find out the structural stability of the building as well as all other conditions of the building for the purpose of usage of thousands of students (girl students) and file a detailed report to that effect along with the Advocate Commissioner.

(b) In this regard, it is open to the Superintending Engineer, PWD as well as the

Engineering expert to be deputed by CSIR-SERC, Chennai to have a joint inspection and to prepare and give a joint report as indicated above.

(c) However if there is any difference of opinion arose between these two Engineering experts, they would be at liberty to prepare and file a separate technical report on the structural soundness / stability of the building concerned and the same shall be taken note of by the Advocate Commissioner who along with such common report or separate reports to be filed by the experts, file his report to the Court below as directed in the impugned order within a period of thirty days (30 days) from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

(d) In case of any further time is required by the Advocate Commissioner to complete the task, request can be made to the Court below for extension of time.

(e) The remuneration for the expert to be deputed by CSIR-SERC, Chennai to be indicated by such organisation in writing, shall be paid only by the defendants.

(f) In this regard, once the bill is raised by CSIR-SERC, Chennai, the same shall be paid by the defendants directly to the CSIR-SERC, Chennai, on proper receipt / acknowledgment.

(g) On production of copy of this order along with the request to be made by the Advocate Commissioner, the Institution head of CSIR-SERC, Chennai, shall do the needful as indicated above. Therefore a copy of this order shall also be communicated by the Registry to the Institution head of Structural Engineering Research Centre-CSIR, Chennai.

With the aforesaid orders, the order impugned is modified accordingly and with such modification, this Civil Revision Petition is disposed of. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. However there shall be no order as to costs.

24-10-2019

Index: Yes

Speaking order

tsvn

28/30

To

1. The XVII Additional City Civil Court
Chennai.
2. The Director
CSIR-Structural Engineering Research Centre,
(Council of Scientific and Industrial Research)
CSIR Campus, CSIR Road,
Taramani, Chennai - 600 113.



WEB COPY

R.SURESH KUMAR, J

tsvn



order in
C.R.P.(PD).No.2817 of 2019

WEB COPY

24-10-2019