

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.11.2019

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.SATHYANARAYANAN
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.SESHASAYEE

W.P.NO.29936 OF 2019

A.R.Sujatha

.. Petitioner

Vs

1. Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority
Represented by its Member Secretary
Thalamuthu Natarajan Maaligai
No.1, Gandhi Irwin Road
Egmore, Chennai - 600 008.
2. Corporation of Chennai
Represented by its Commissioner
Rippon Buildings, No.1131 EVR Periyar Salai
Park Town, Chennai - 600 003.
3. The Zonal Officer
Zone-8, Corporation of Chennai
No.36B, II Cross Street
Pulla Avenue, Shenoy Nagar,
Chennai - 600 030.
4. The Executive Engineer
Zone-8, Corporation of Chennai
No.36B, II Cross Street
Pulla Avenue, Shenoy Nagar,
Chennai - 600 030.
5. The Hon'ble Secretary (Review Authority)
Housing and Urban Development Department
Presently I/C, Additional Secretary (Technical)
Housing and Urban Development Department
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.
6. L.B.Senthil Kumar

... Respondents

Prayer:-

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 5 to take immediate steps to demolish the illegal construction and dismantle the sheds put in the common open terrace, at AB-126 (Old Door Nos.AB-125&38D), 4th Avenue, Shanthi Colony, Anna Nagar, Chennai - 600 040, pursuant to their Notice No. REGIONCENTRAL / TPENF/1810/2018, dated 17/05/2018 of the Corporation of Chennai, issued against the 6th respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.Kishore Kumar

For Respondents : Mr.P.S.Ganesh [R1]

Dr.C.Ravichandran [R2, R3 & R4]
Mr.P.S.Sivashanmuga Sundaram
Special Government Pleader [R5]
Mr.Prabhakaran, Senior Counsel
Assisted by Mr.A.Rajesh Kanna[R6]

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by M.SATHYANARAYANAN, J.]

This writ petition is filed by a Practising Advocate, the owner of a flat bearing Door No.AB-123, Ground Floor, Shanthi Colony, Anna Nagar, Chennai - 600 040, praying for issuance of Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents 1 to 5 to take immediate steps to demolish the illegal construction and dismantle the sheds put up by the sixth respondent in the common open space at AB-126, 4th Avenue, Shanthi Colony, Anna Nagar, Chennai - 600 040, pursuant to the notice dated 17.05.2018, issued by the second respondent.

2.1 The writ petition was listed for admission on 22.10.2019, and on that day, the counsels representing the respondents accepted notice and the learned counsel appearing for the sixth respondent has also brought to the knowledge of this Court that, as against the Locking & Sealing and Demolition Notice, dated 05.4.2018, issued by the fourth respondent, a statutory revision / appeal under Section 80-A of the Tamil Nadu Town and Country Planning Act, 1971 (in short "TCP Act") has been filed and therefore, this Court directed the listing of this matter on 25.10.2019 in the motion list.

2.2 The case was listed on 05.11.2019, and on that day, the learned counsel appearing for the sixth respondent prays for short accommodation and therefore, the matter was adjourned to 13.11.2019 (today).

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has drawn the attention of this Court to the affidavit filed in support of this writ petition as well as the supporting documents in the form of typed set of documents and would submit that the sixth respondent had purchased a flat bearing No.AB-126, (Old Door Nos.AB-1258 & 38D), 4th Avenue, Shanthi Colony, Anna Nagar, Chennai - 600 040, admeasuring to an extent of 801 sq.ft. (super plinth area), together with 1775 sq.ft. of Undivided Share of Land, through a registered sale deed dated 17.03.2017, registered on the file of the Sub Registrar, Anna Nagar, and without any permission or authorisation, had done some work on the terrace/open common space area and started a commercial venture under the name and style of "Kongu Naattu Thottathu Virundhu". It is the further submission of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that on account of the unauthorised construction put up on the common space/area, coupled with the fact that unauthorised using of the residential building as non-residential, the petitioner was constrained to file a Civil Suit in C.S.No.889/2017 before this Court against the sixth respondent herein, praying for damages of Rs.25,00,000/- and for a permanent injunction restraining him, his agents or anyone from converting, constructing or to do any alteration, or new additional construction or changing the flat with undivided share of land in the Schedule-B property in any nature other than as to what it was allotted without any valid permission thereof from other owners of the flats and also sanction from Corporation (or) Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority and for a mandatory injunction to restore the land, amenities, open space and building in Schedule-B to its original condition as it was allotted by removing all the new additional construction, alteration and conversions. Pending disposal of the said Civil Suit, the petitioner has filed O.A.No.1144 of 2017, praying for an interim injunction and the learned Single Judge of this Court, had granted an exparte order of injunction, vide order dated 14.11.2017.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that despite subsistence and knowledge of the said order of interim injunction, the sixth respondent continues to use the said unauthorised additional construction for commercial purpose and in this regard, the petitioner had filed WP. No.29570/2017 against the respondents 1,2 and 3 and also against the sixth respondent herein, who was arrayed as fourth respondent in WP. No.29570/2017, praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 to 3 to consider the complaint of the petitioner dated 09.10.2017, and to take immediate steps and to pass order against the sixth respondent from converting, constructing or to carry out alteration in the new additional construction. The Division Bench of this Court, vide order

dated 20.11.2017, have taken note of the subsistence of the above cited interim order of injunction and granted liberty to the petitioner to bring it to the knowledge of the official respondents 1 to 3 about the order passed in O.A.No.1144 of 2007 and if the private respondent is found evading the order of injunction granted by this Court, and proceeding with the construction, it is open to the writ petitioner to move Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, against the private respondent (sixth respondent herein) or against his agents, men or anyone claiming under him. There was also a direction to the official respondents that upon receipt of the representation submitted by the petitioner, official respondents are directed not to act contrary to the above said order of interim injunction and they were also put on notice that violating the Court order would attract Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, and disposed of the writ petition accordingly.

5. The Assistant Executive Engineer/U-22, of Corporation of Chennai, Regional Officer-Central, has issued a notice calling for the approved plan dated 24.11.2017, followed by notice to stop work, and Locking & Sealing and Demolition notice dated 05.04.2018, for the reason that in terms of the earlier notices, the details sought for have not been furnished by the petitioner as well as by the sixth respondent. In response to the letter of the Assistant Executive Engineer/U-22, of Corporation of Chennai, Regional Officer-Central, dated 24.11.2017, calling for approved plan, the petitioner has submitted her reply dated 29.11.2017, enclosing the planning permission obtained from the Corporation of Chennai.

6. It is brought to the knowledge of this Court by Mr.Prabhakaran, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the sixth respondent that as against the Locking, Sealing and Demolition notice dated 05.04.2018, the sixth respondent has filed a statutory revision under Section 80-A of the TCP Act, before the Secretary to Government (Review Authority), Housing and Urban Development Department, Secretariat, Chennai - 600 009, and the same is pending.

7. In sum and substance, it is the submission of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that admittedly, the sixth respondent had converted the residential premises into non-residential and had converted the open space/common area for running a hotel and the said conversion was also effected without any permission whatsoever, and no necessary and requisite licence and permission having been obtained by the sixth respondent from the authority concerned to run a retreatary/hotel. He also reiterated that since it is a gross violation and utter disregard in not obeying the interim order of injunction granted by this Court in O.A.No.1144 of 2017 in

C.S.No.889 of 2017, and started doing commercial operations in the said premises, this Court may direct the officials of the Corporation of Chennai to put into effect the Locking and Sealing notice at the first instance and depending upon the result of the statutory revision/appeal said to have been filed by the sixth respondent, further steps may follow.

8. Dr.C.Ravichandran, learned counsel appearing for the respondents 2,3 and 4 has invited the attention of this Court to the report of the third respondent dated 24.10.2019 and would submit that the officials of the Greater Corporation of Chennai had visited the premises in question and caused inspection, and it was noticed that the sixth respondent is running a restaurant under the name and style of "Kongu Nattu Thottathu Virundhu" without displaying the licence to run the same and thereafter, the officials have lodged a complaint to the Revenue Department, Greater Corporation of Chennai on 22.10.2019, based on which, the Assistant Revenue Officer, Zone-VIII and the Licence Inspector, Division -100, Zone-VIII of Greater Corporation of Chennai, had inspected the restaurant and issued a notice dated 23.10.2019, under Sections 279 and 287 of the Chennai City Municipal Corporation Act, 1919, directing the sixth respondent to apply for licence by paying the scheduled licence fees within seven days from the date of receipt of the notice, and also intimated the consequences to be faced by him, if not following the regulations laid by the authority and accordingly, the sixth respondent has applied for necessary licence/permission, however, the said application was rejected, vide communication of the third respondent dated 08.11.2019 in Ma.Aa.8.R.D.Na.Ka.No.R/02630/2019, stating that the following documents viz., (a) property tax receipts for the year 2019-2020; (b) signature of the applicant is not available in the surrender statement; (c) No Objection Certificate issued by the Fire and Rescue Service in running the retreatary is not enclosed; (d) details of workers and employers employed in the said hotel and the details showing the deduction of amount towards professional tax etc., and (e) documents enclosing showing payment of property tax etc., have not been enclosed. It is also the submission of the learned Standing Counsel that pursuant to the issuance of Locking, Sealing and Demolition notice dated 05.04.2018, by the fourth respondent and filing of the statutory appeal/revision by the sixth respondent under Sec.80-A of TCP Act, and pendency of the appeal before the Appellate authority, further steps have not been taken by the Authority.

9. Mr.S.Prabhakaran, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Mr.A.Rajesh Khanna, learned counsel appearing for the sixth respondent has invited the attention of the Court to the counter affidavit as well as the additional typed set of documents of

the sixth respondent dated 13.11.2019 and would submit that apart from invoking the statutory remedy under Section 80A of the TCP Act, the sixth respondent has also filed an application under Section 113(C) of the TCP Act, for regularisation of the alleged unauthorised construction and would pray that till a decision is taken in the pending statutory appeal/revision as well as in the application filed under Section 113(C) of TCP Act, further proceedings of the authority may be deferred.

10. Mr.P.S.Ganesh, learned Standing Counsel appearing for CMDA would submit that under Section 113(C) of the TCP Act, any land or building constructed unauthorisedly on or before 1st day of July 2007 are exempted from the provisions of this Act or rules or regulations made thereunder and admittedly, the alleged unauthorised occupation of the common area and conversion of the residential to non-residential by the sixth respondent finds place in the year 2017 and therefore, the application filed under Section 113(C) of the TCP Act on 11.09.2019 by the sixth respondent, seeking exemption, is not maintainable and he would further add that depending upon the outcome of the statutory remedy availed by the sixth respondent before the Appellate Authority- the Secretary to Government (Review Authority), Housing and Urban Development Department, Secretariat, Chennai - 600009, further proceedings would take place.

11. This Court has carefully considered the rival submissions and also perused the materials placed before it.

12.1 This Court can take judicial notice of the fact that the violations in the form of unauthorised / deviated construction, and unauthorised usage of the premises, is rampant in the city of Chennai. The propensity to engage such kind of activities would seem to have no checks or limits. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in a catena of decisions, have come down very heavily upon unauthorised construction/developments which are taking place and it is relevant to quote some of the judgments.

(a) In Friends Colony Development Committee Vs. State of Orissa and others reported in [2004 [8] SCC 733] the issue relating to the unauthorised construction and regularisation of the same by levying compounding fees, came up for consideration and it is relevant to extract the same:-

The material brought on record disclose a very sorry and sordid state of affairs prevailing in the matter of illegal and unauthorized constructions in the city of Cuttack. Builders violate with impunity the sanctioned building

plans and indulge deviations. The builder conveniently walks away having pocketed the money leaving behind the unfortunate occupants to face the music in the event of unauthorized constructions being detected or exposed and threatened with demolition. If such activities are to stop some stringent actions are required to be taken by ruthlessly demolishing the illegal constructions and non-compoundable deviations, the unwary purchasers who shall be the sufferers must be adequately compensated by the builder. The arms of the law must stretch to catch hold of such unscrupulous builders. At the same time, in order to secure vigilant performance of duties, responsibility should be fixed on the officials whose duty it was to prevent unauthorized constructions, but who failed in doing so either by negligence or by connivance.

In the present case, the builder added an additional fifth floor on the building which was totally unauthorised. In spite of the disputes and litigation pending he parted with his interest in the property and inducted occupants on all the floors, including the additional one.

Zoning and planning do result in hardship to individual property owners as their freedom to use their property in the way they like, is subjected to regulation and control. But for this reason alone the controlling regulations cannot be termed as arbitrary or unreasonable. The private interest stands subordinated to the public good. The power to plan development of city and to regulate the building activity therein flows from the police power of the State. The exercise of such governmental power is justified on account of its being reasonably necessary for the public health, safety, morals or general welfare and ecological considerations."

(b) In Consumer Action Group rep.by its Trustee Vs. State of Tamil Nadu rep. by its Secretary to Government, Law Department, Secretariat, Chennai-9 and others reported in 2006 [4] CTC 483 [DB], it is held that water and electricity connection should be contingent on completion certificate. Sl.No.(ix) of the direction reads thus:-

"(ix) To avoid future violations, buildings should be certified as having been constructed in compliance of planning permit and other applicable laws. The Certifying Officer will be personally responsible if any illegal building is certified. Electricity, water connection and occupation should be contingent on such certificate. In respect of the builders who have been identified by the Monitoring Committee as having put up illegal buildings, constructions by such builders should be certified for compliance only by the Chief Planner, who shall bear personal responsibility.

30 The Development Control Rules prohibit use of building without obtaining completion certificate. The direction to provide electricity, water and sewerage connection without insisting Completion Certificate from CMDA would amount to permission to put the building to use which is prohibited by statute. The Electricity, Water and Sewerage Boards are not bound to entertain application for such amenities without submitting the Completion Certificate issued by CMDA.

31 The authorities exercising statutory functions under various enactments must assist CMDA to implement the Development Control Rules. If such authorities entertain request and provide electricity, water and sewerage connection, it would help the builder to bypass the mandatory requirement of the Statute, requiring completion certificate to occupy the building. We therefore hold that the Chennai Metro Water Supply and Sewerage Board and Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, have no authority to issue electricity, water and sewerage connection without producing of the Completion Certificate from CMDA. We are therefore of the view that the builders have no right to approach the Court for mandamus to provide electricity, water and Sewerage connections, without insisting Completion Certificate from CMDA."

(c) In *Santhi Sports Club Vs Union of India*, reported in 2009 [15] SCC 704 : AIR 2010 SC 433, the Hon'ble Apex Court observed that the Executive must take stringent action to curtail the menace of illegal construction and in paragraph 75 observed as follows:-

"75 Unfortunately, despite repeated judgments by the this Court and High Courts, the builders and other affluent people engaged in the construction activities, who have, over the years shown scant respect for regulatory mechanism envisaged in the municipal and other similar laws, as also the master plans, zonal development plans, sanctioned plans etc., have received encouragement and support from the State apparatus. As and when the courts have passed orders or the officers of local and other bodies have taken action for ensuring rigorous compliance of laws relating to planned development of the cities and urban areas and issued directions for demolition of the illegal/unauthorized constructions, those in power have come forward to protect the wrong doers either by issuing administrative orders or enacting laws for regularization of illegal and unauthorized constructions in the name of compassion and hardship. Such actions have done irreparable harm to the concept of planned development of the cities and urban areas. It is high time that the executive and political apparatus of the State take serious view of the menace of illegal and unauthorized constructions and stop their support to the lobbies of affluent class of builders and others, else even the rural areas of the country will soon witness similar chaotic conditions."

(d) In yet another decision reported in 2010 [2] SCC 27 : AIR 2010 SC 1030 [Priyanka Estates International Private Limited V. State of Assam], the Hon'ble Apex Court, once again sounded a note of caution by taking into consideration large scale unauthorised construction and in paragraphs 55 and 56, has observed as follows:-

"55 It is a matter of common knowledge that illegal and unauthorised constructions beyond the sanctioned plans are on rise, may be due to paucity of land in big cities. Such activities are required to be dealt with by firm hands otherwise builders/colonisers would continue to build or construct beyond the sanctioned and approved plans and would still go scot-free. Ultimately, it is the flat owners who fall prey to such activities as the ultimate desire of a common man is to have a shelter of his own. Such unlawful constructions are definitely against

the public interest and hazardous to the safety of occupiers and residents of multi-storeyed buildings. To some extent both parties can be said to be equally responsible for this. Still the greater loss would be of those flat owners whose flats are to be demolished as compared to the Builder.

56 Even though on earlier occasions also, under similar circumstances, there have been judgments of this Court which should have been a pointer to all the builders that raising unauthorised construction never pays and is against the interest of society at large, but, no heed to it has been given by the builders. Rules, regulations and bye-laws are made by Corporation or by Development Authorities, taking in view the larger public interest of the society and it is a bounden duty of the citizens to obey and follow such rules which are made for their benefit. If unauthorised constructions are allowed to stand or given a seal of approval by court then it is bound to affect the public at large. An individual has a right, including a fundamental right, within a reasonable limit, it inroads the public rights leading to public inconvenience, therefore, it is to be curtailed to that extent."

It is also very pertinent to point out at this juncture though CMDA as well as Corporation of Chennai are under statutory obligation to monitor and take appropriate action with regard to the unauthorised constructions/ developments, for the reasons best known to them, they always remain idle and their inaction has also been noted by a Division Bench of this Court in the decision in S.Prakash Chand Jain V. The State of Tamil Nadu rep. by its Secretary, Housing and Urban Development Department, Fort St George, Chennai and others reported in [(2014) 2 MLJ 551], and the Division Bench of this Court, after placing reliance upon several decisions rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, has observed that "the unholy nexus between the builder and certain officials of the CMDA, Corporation [Corporation of Chennai] gives encroachment to more and more people, to violate building laws with impunity."

12.2 The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the latest decision in Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai and Ors. Vs. Sunbeam High Tech Developers Private Ltd., reported in [MANU/SC/1467/2018], has dealt with the issue, "whether if a Municipal Corporation demolishes a structure, in exercise of

powers vested with it, but violation of the procedure prescribed, can the High Court direct the 'owner/occupier' of the building to reconstruct the demolished structure?". The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has taken into consideration the various provisions of the Bombay Municipal Corporation Act, has held that the directions to reconstruct the structures as ordered by the Bombay High Court cannot be sustained, and also putting in place the technology and mechanism illustrated in the said decision and it is relevant to extract paragraph Nos.19, 20 & 21 of under :

"19. Times have changed. Technology has advanced. However, the legal fraternity continues to live in a state of status quo. Sopan's case was decided on 09.02.1996. More than two decades have elapsed. The Courts must not be hidebound by old decisions and the law must develop in accordance with changing times.

20. All concerned viz., the State, the Municipal authorities and the High Court need to take note and advantage of advancement in technology. We have been informed that disputes with regard to the dimensions and nature of the structure arise especially in those cases where rural or suburban areas are included at a later stage in the municipalities. Some of these structures have no sanctioned plans. The Development Control and Promotion Regulations for Greater Mumbai, 2034, provide that no permission shall be required to carry out tenantable repairs to the existing buildings which were constructed with the approval of the competent authority, or are in existence since 17.04.1964 in respect of residential structures, and 01.04.1962 in respect of non-residential structures, as required Under Section 342 of the MMC Act. We have already noted what is meant by tenantable repairs. This is explained in Section 342 of the MMC Act. Only repairs envisaged in the explanation are permitted to be carried out without permission and all other repairs have to be carried out with permission. Since these old buildings do not have plans it is difficult to find out whether the construction carried out is actually tenantable repairs or the structures are being constructed/reconstructed for which permission is required.

21. There is no difficulty to find a solution to this problem if the State is inclined to do so. Till the State frames any laws in this regard, we direct that before any construction/reconstruction, or repair not being a tenantable repair is carried out, the owner/occupier/builder/contractor/architect, in fact

all of them should be required to furnish a plan of the structure as it exists. This map can be taken on record and, thereafter, the construction can be permitted. In such an eventuality even if the demolition is illegal it will be easy to know what were the dimensions of the building. This information should not only be in paper form in the nature of a plan, but should also be in the form of 3D visual information, in the nature of photographs, videos etc."

12.3 In the decision of Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai case cited supra, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in paragraph No.22, has also noted that mostly in all over the country, when illegal construction has been identified by the authorities concerned, the owners or the occupants of the alleged illegal construction make a claim that the said construction has been in existence for long time and it is relevant to extract Paragraph No.22 as under :

"22. All over the country we find that when people raise illegal constructions it is claimed that the said construction has been existing for long. The answer is to get Geomapping done. The relevant technology is Geographic Information System (GIS). If on Google Maps one can get a road view, we see no reason as to why this technology cannot be used by the municipal corporations. At the first stage we direct that all the cities in Maharashtra where the population is 50 lakhs or more the municipal authorities will get Geomapping done not only of the municipal areas but also of areas 10 Kms. from the outer boundary. This can be done by satellite, drones or vehicles. Once one has the whole city geomapped it would be easy to control illegal constructions. We further direct the State of Maharashtra to ensure that sufficient funds are made available to the municipal corporations concerned and this exercise should be completed within a period of one year from the date of this order.

13. The sixth respondent in his counter affidavit dated 13.11.2019, have not taken any specific stand that he did not encroach upon the open space area of the flats in question and further that his construction and usage of the building for commercial purpose is authorised. It also prima facie appears that the sixth respondent has totally disregarded the order of interim injunction granted by the learned Single Judge of this Court in O.A.No.1144 of 2017 in C.S.No.889/2017. It is also brought to the knowledge of the Court that the petitioner has filed C.S.No.889/2017 before this Court against the sixth

respondent and later it was transferred to the City Civil Court and numbered as O.S.No.2061 of 2019 and is pending on the file of V Additional City Civil Court, Chennai and the sixth respondent, being the sole defendant in O.S.No.2061 of 2019, has filed his written statement and evidence on the side of the plaintiff is completed and the trial is in the midway. The sixth respondent, being the sole defendant in O.A.No.1144 of 2017 in C.S.No.889/2017, did not take any steps to vacate the order of injunction granted in favour of the writ petitioner/plaintiff therein.

14. The photographs of the unauthorised construction and usage of the said premises have been produced before this Court. A perusal of the photographs would disclose that the sixth respondent in the open common area has put up some permanent structures in the form of steel sheds and in the front opening of the said premises, he has put up huge two storeyed construction showing that he is running a hotel in the name and style of "Kongu Naattu Thottathu Virundhu". These photographs are taken on file and shall form part of this order.

15. It is represented on behalf of the sixth respondent that the statutory appeal/revision was filed on 04.06.2018 along with a petition for stay and the same is pending without any interim order and the attitude exhibited by the sixth respondent, more particularly, the grave disobedience to the interim order of injunction passed by the learned Single Judge, of this Court on 14.11.2017, and that apart, he did not obtain any permission/licence to run a restaurant or to carry out commercial activities.

16. In the light of the above facts and circumstances and the reasons assigned, this Court is passing the following order.

- (a) The writ petition is disposed of and the sixth respondent is directed not to run the restaurant/hotel/retreatery, till the disposal of the statutory appeal/revision said to have been preferred before the Appellate Authority.
- (b) The jurisdictional TANGEDCO officials are directed to disconnect the electricity connection granted to the premises at AB-125, 4th Avenue, Anna Nagar, Chennai - 600 040, where the sixth respondent is running his retreatery/hotel, till the disposal of the statutory appeal/revision.
- (c) The respondents 1 to 4 as well as TANGEDCO, depending upon the result of the statutory appeal/special revision said to have been preferred by the sixth respondent before the Appellate Authority, shall take immediate and necessary

steps in accordance with law and act accordingly, as expeditiously as possible.

(d)The Appellate Authority shall accord priority and dispose of the appeal /statutory revision dated 04.06.2018 filed by the sixth respondent, pending on it's file, in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

ds

To:

1. The Member Secretary,
Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority
Thalamuthu Natarajan Maaligai
No.1, Gandhi Irwin Road
Egmore, Chennai - 600 008.
2. The Commissioner,
Corporation of Chennai
Rippon Buildings, No.1131 EVR Periyar Salai
Park Town, Chennai - 600 003.
3. The Zonal Officer
Zone-8, Corporation of Chennai
No.36B, II Cross Street
Pulla Avenue, Shenoy Nagar,
Chennai - 600 030.
4. The Executive Engineer
Zone-8, Corporation of Chennai
No.36B, II Cross Street
Pulla Avenue, Shenoy Nagar,
Chennai - 600 030.
5. The Hon'ble Secretary (Review Authority)
Housing and Urban Development Department
Presently I/C, Additional Secretary (Technical)
Housing and Urban Development Department
Secretariat, Fort St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

Copy To

1. The Tamil Nadu Generation and Distribution Corporation,
Thirumangalam Complex, Anna Nagar West, Chennai - 600040
2. The Secretary to Government, Housing and Urban Development
Department, Secretariat, Fort.St.George, Chennai - 600 009.

+1cc to Mr.N.Kishore Kumar, Advocate, S.R.No.94311
+1cc to Mr.P.S.Ganesh, Advocate, S.R.No.94206
+1cc to Dr.C.Ravichandran, Advocate, S.R.No.94073
+1cc to Mr.A.Rajesh Kanna, Advocate, S.R.No.95103
+1cc to the Special Government Pleader, S.R.No.94377

W.P.No.29936 of 2019

NR(CO)
CS/10/01/2020