



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Orders Reserved on : 25.04.2019

Orders Pronounced on :
14.06.2019

WEB COPY

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE R.MAHADEVANW.P(MD)Nos.3444 and 3445, 953 to 969, 823 to 834, 1868 to 1874, 2549
and 2550, 2202, 2203 and 2206 of 2017andWMP(MD)Nos.2801 and 2802 of 2017, 805 to 821 of 2017, 674 to 685 of
2017, 1532 to 1538 of 2017, 2118 and 2119 of 2019, 1833, 1842 and
1827 of 2017

L.Jesuraja	.. Petitioner in WP(MD)No.3444 OF 2017
M.Sivamurugan	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 3445/ 2017
V.Saravanan	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 953/ 2017
A.Muthukrishnakumar	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 954/ 2017
G.Balasubramanian	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 955/ 2017
P.Sivarajan,	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 956/ 2017
M. Raja,	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 957/ 2017
S.Satheesh Kumar	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 958/ 2017
M.Anbarasan,	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 959/ 2017
M.Manikandan	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 960/ 2017
G.Varadharajan,	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 961/ 2017
G.Karthick	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 962/ 2017
N.Muthukannan	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 963/ 2017
V.Sureshkumar	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 964/ 2017
N.Arumugam	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 965/ 2017
B.Rajasekar	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 966/ 2017
V.Sabarinathan	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 967/ 2017
P.Nagabalan	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 968/ 2017
M.Senthil	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 969/ 2017
B.Devaraj	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 823/ 2017
G.Rajasekaran	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 824/ 2017
K.Muthumanickam	.. Petitioner in WP(MD). 825/ 2017



M.Muthukumar .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 826/ 2017
C.Arockia Baskar, .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 827/ 2017
N.Ravikumar, .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 828/ 2017
S.Suresh .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 829/ 2017
K.Manikandan .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 830/ 2017
V.Gnanasekaran .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 831/ 2017
B.Prabhu, .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 832/ 2017
R.Baskar .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 833/ 2017
K.Selvapandi .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 834/ 2017
P.Saravanakumar .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 1868/ 2017
A.Prabhu .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 1869/ 2017
S.Palanivasan .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 1870/ 2017
K.Asaitambi, .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 1871/ 2017
P.Christopher .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 1872/ 2017
P.Soundarapandi, .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 1873/ 2017
Ramesh Kumar .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 1874/ 2017
R.Dhamodharan .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 2549/ 2017
S.Sankar Ganesh .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 2550/ 2017
Velmuruganandam .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 2202/ 2017
G.Selvakumar .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 2203/ 2017
Narayanakumar .. Petitioner in WP(MD). 2206/ 2017

Vs.

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Municipal Administration and
Water Supply Department, Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 9.
- 2.The Director of Municipal Administration,
Chepauk, Chennai - 5.
- 3.The Commissioner of Corporation,
Madurai Corporation,
Madurai.
.. Respondents in WP(MD) Nos.3444, 3445, 953 to 969 of 2017



1.The Secretary to Government,
Municipal Administration & Water Supply Department,
Govt. of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St. George, Chennai-09.

2.The Director of Municipal Administration,
Chepauk, Chennai-05.

3.The Assistant Commissioner Of Corporation,
Madurai Corporation, Madurai.

..Respondents in WP(MD). Nos.823 to 834 of 2017

1.The Secretary to Government
Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department,
Secretariat, Chennai.

2.The Commissioner
Madurai Corporation, Madurai.

..Respondents in WP(MD)Nos. 1868 to 1874,
2549 and 2550 of 2017

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by the Secretary to Government,
Municipal Administration and Water Supply Department,
Fort.St.George, Chennai 9

2.The Director of Municipal Administration,
Chepauk, Chennai 600 005

3.The Commissioner
Madurai Municipal Corporation,
Arignar Anna Maaligai,
Madurai 600 002

..Respondents in WP(MD)Nos. 2202,2203 and 2206/ 2017

**COMMON PRAYER IN WP(MD)Nos.3444, 3445, 952 to 969, 2202,
2203 and 2206 of 2017:**

Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the respondents herein to regularize the petitioner's services as Driver in the time scale of pay with all attendant and monetary benefits from the initial



date of his appointment within a reasonable time.

Prayer in WP(MD).Nos. 823 to 834 / 2017 :

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court To issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the impugned order of the 3rd respondent in Ref.Ma.Ni. 27/32784/2016 dated 31.8.2016 quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to regularize the services of the petitioner from the date of his initial appointment as Driver in the time of scale of pay with all attendant and monetary benefits within a reasonable time may be fixed by this Honble Court.

Prayer in WP(MD). 1868 to 1874. 2549 and 2550 / 2017 :

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court To issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to regularize the services of the Petitioner as Driver in the 2nd Respondent Corporation in the time scale of pay with all attendant and monetary benefits from the initial date of appointment of the petitioner.

Counsel for Petitioners

Mr.G.M.Xavier in WP(MD).No.3444&3445/2017

Mr.C.Jeganathan for Veera Associates in WP(MD).No.953 to 969,
823 to 834/2017.

Mr.K.Hemakarthiskeyan in WP(MD).No.1868 to 1874, 2549 and
2550/2017.

Mr.T.Vadivelan in WP(MD).No.2202,2203 & 2206/2017.

Counsel for Respondents

Mr.C.M.Mari Chelliah Prabhu ,AGP for R.1&2 in All WP's

Mr.J.GunaseelanMuthiah for R.3 in WP(MD).No.3444&3445/2017



Mr.V.Shanmugaselvam for R.3 in WP(MD).No.953 to 969,
823 to 834/2017.

Mr.R.Murali for R.2 in WP(MD).No.1868 to 1874.

Mr.T.S.Mohamed Mohideen for R.3 in WP(MD).No.2202,2203 &
2206/2017.

Mr.P.Prabhu Ramachandran for R.2 in WP(MD).No. 2549 &
2550/2017.

C O M M O N O R D E R

While W.P(MD)Nos.3444 and 3445, 953 to 969, 1868 to 1874, 2549 and 2550, 2202, 2203 and 2206 of 2017 have been filed seeking a direction to the respondents to regularize the petitioners' services as Drivers in the time scale of pay with all attendant and monetary benefits from the initial date of their appointments, W.P(MD)Nos. 823 to 834 of 2017 have been filed, challenging the impugned orders passed by the third respondent dated 31.08.2016, 28.09.2016 and 21.09.2016 and also for a consequential direction to regularize the petitioners' services as Drivers in the time scale of pay from the date of their initial appointments with all attendant and monetary benefits.

2. Since the issue involved in all the writ petitions lie on a narrow campus and inter-linked, these writ petitions are taken up together for final disposal by way of this common order.

3. The short facts leading to the filing of the present writ petitions are as follows:

(i)The petitioners are qualified to hold the post of Drivers. They registered their names in the District Employment Exchange, Madurai for employment. The Commissioner of Madurai Corporation called for eligible candidates from the District Employment Exchange, Madurai, for filling up the post of Drivers created under the Solid Waste Management Project, which is a continuous project for disposal of solid waste within the city of Madurai.

(ii)The petitioners received communications from the Commissioner of Corporation, Madurai to participate in the interview for filling up the post of Drivers. The petitioners after successfully completing the selection process, were appointed as Drivers by the proceedings of the third respondent dated 26.03.2013



and their appointments were subsequently approved by the Appointment Committee and as per the said proceedings, the petitioners are now working as Drivers.

(iii) The grievance of the petitioners is that even after completion of four years of service in the said post, their services have not been regularized and till date they have been working as daily wage employees. Seeking regularization of service, the petitioners have made representations to the respondents. Some of the representations are pending without any consideration and some representations have been rejected by the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Madurai. Hence, the petitioners are before this Court seeking consideration of their representations and also to quash the impugned orders already passed.

4. In WP(MD)Nos.3447 of 2017, 823 to 834 of 2017, 1868 to 1874 of 2017 and W.P(MD)Nos.2202, 2203 and 2206 of 2017, the Commissioner, Madurai Corporation has filed counter affidavit, wherein among other things, it is stated as follows:

(i)The petitioners were appointed as Drivers purely on temporary basis and the same has been clearly mentioned in the order of appointment dated 26.03.2013. Even at the time of calling the petitioners for interview, it was specifically mentioned that the call is made only for daily wages. The petitioners, having fully aware of the fact that their appointments as Drivers are made purely on temporarily basis, are now seeking regularization of their services with time scale of pay, which is a misconceived one.

(ii)The post of Drivers has to be filled up both by the direct recruitment as well as by way of promotion. Hence, vacancy in the post of Driver and the continuous employment of the petitioners in the Madurai Corporation will not give right to them, seeking regularization.

(iii)The Municipal Corporation Service Rules has no provision to regularize the service of daily wage employees and hence the request made by the petitioners seeking regularization cannot be considered. The Government had already advised the Corporation not to regularize the service of daily wage employees, which will lead to back door entry into the services of Corporation. Therefore, the grounds raised by the petitioners, seeking regularization are not sustainable and as such, the writ petitions deserve dismissal.

5.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the sanctioned post of Drivers in the third respondent Corporation is 99. After introduction of Solid Waste Management Scheme, the vehicle strength has been increased and as such, the third respondent Corporation requires 350 drivers, whereas, only 54 persons are working on regular employment. Therefore, it is made clear that there are several vacancies exist



for regular and continuous work. Further, the petitioners were appointed in the regular vacancy and they have been working for several years and therefore, their claim for regularization of their services cannot be denied by the respondents.

6. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the respondents 1 and 2 and the learned counsel appearing for the remaining respondents uniformly contended that in the call letters as well as in the appointment order it has been specifically mentioned that the appointments are made only on daily wage basis. Further, as per the Municipal Corporation General Subordinate Service Rules, the post of Driver has to be filled up by direct recruitment as well as by promotion. Admittedly, with the required qualifications, Class IV employees are available to the post of Drivers by promotion. Further, the contention of the petitioners that the third respondent Corporation requires 350 drivers is false without any materials. It is also stated that unless the Government increase the sanctioned strength to the post of Drivers, the case of the petitioners for regularization of their service cannot be considered. Therefore, these writ petitions deserve to be dismissed.

7. The only point that comes up for consideration in the present writ petitions is as to whether the relief sought for by the petitioners can be granted in their favour?

8. On earlier occasion, when these matters came up for hearing, viz., on 28.02.2017, before Justice S.Vaidyanathan, the learned Judge has observed that **"the petitioners have not produced any material evidence to show how much number of days they worked; merely because a batch is pending, that cannot be a ground to grant the relief sought for by the petitioner; however, on account of the learned counsel mistake in not furnishing the details, the petitioners should not be put to suffer; hence to give one more opportunity to furnish the details about the mode of payment, as to the number of days worked etc., the petitioners are given time till 15.03.2017"**.

9. Subsequently, on 20.03.2019, the learned counsel for the petitioner (W.P.No.3444 of 2017) (L. Jesuraja) has filed an Additional Typed Set of Papers containing salary entries of the petitioner in the Bank passbook, between 16.07.2013 and 10.02.2017, showing that the salary is being credited every month from Madurai Corporation to her every month.

10. In these cases, the petitioners, who are working as Drivers in Madurai Corporation, are claiming benefits under the Tamil Nadu Industrial Establishments (Conferment of Permanent Status to Workmen) Act, 1981, (Tamil Nadu Act 46 of 1981).

10.1. The attack on the said ground by the petitioners cannot be taken up by this Court at this stage, because a similar claim of regularization made by the daily wage sweepers is pending consideration before this Court in WA (MD) No.1163 and 1164 of 2016,



with a specific legal objection made by the Corporation to the effect that, as to whether the Corporation comes under the definition of 'establishment' in terms of Tamil Nadu Act 46 of 1981.

11. The petitioners herein and other Drivers, who were appointed on 26.03.2013, are specifically recruited to maintain the new vehicles purchased under Solid Waste Management Scheme. In the proceedings, it was made clear that the petitioners were appointed as Drivers purely on temporary basis by the Corporation. Prior to issuance of the appointment orders also, while the Corporation invited the petitioners for interview, through letter, dated 07.03.2013, it was specifically mentioned that the 'call for' is on daily wage basis. Hence, the contention of the petitioners that they are appointed in the regular vacancy becomes nullity, since the petitioners are fully aware of the scope and appointment to the post of Drivers during appointment itself.

11.1. Resolution No.68, dated 30.11.2011 of the Council of Corporation authorizes the Commissioner of Corporation to go for temporary appointment of Drivers. Hence, the third respondent / Commissioner of Corporation, who is duty bound to follow the Resolution, in terms of Section 23 of the Madurai City Municipal Corporation Act, had appointed the petitioners on daily wage basis. Further, as per Rule 8 of the General Rules, it is open for the Corporation to appoint persons on contract basis. A person, who is so appointed shall not be regarded as a member of service to which he is appointed. Apart from that, the age limit of 30 is fixed for any appointment in the Corporation, as per the General Service Rules. There is also a Rule of reservation, which has to be followed, while appointing Class III / IV posts. Under the Municipal Corporation Service Rules, no provision is available to regularize daily wage employees and hence, the request of petitioners herein is far-fetched.

11.2. The Government had introduced Service Rules to Madurai Corporation, vide G.O.Ms.No.237, dated 20.06.1996. As per the above rules, the post of Driver comes under Municipal Corporation General Subordinate Service Rules. The post of Driver is a Group IV post. As per the said Rules, there is a qualification, ratio and mode of recruitment to appoint persons to the post of Driver, where appointment to category of post is to be made by direct recruitment and by promotion, as per the ratio of 1:1. Hence, the contention of the petitioners that there are much vacancies in the post of drivers has no legs to stand, since it will not give vested right to the petitioners to claim regularization.

11.3. From the above, this Court is of the view that if the claim of the petitioners is entertained, it will act against the statutory service Rules and also affects the right of Class IV employees to get due promotion, since it is stated elsewhere in the counter that employees with required qualifications are available and demanding promotion to the post of Driver.



12. The next issue that has to be dealt with by this Court is, as to whether the appointment made on the basis of list sponsored by the Employment Exchange is a legal appointment. The Supreme Court, while considering this issue in **State of Orissa and another vs. Mamata Mohanty, (2011) 3 SCC 436**, held as under:

"36. Therefore, it is a settled legal proposition that no person can be appointed even on a temporary or ad hoc basis without inviting applications from all eligible candidates. If any appointment is made by merely inviting names from the employment exchange or putting a note on the noticeboard, etc. that will not meet the requirement of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution. Such a course violates the mandates of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India as it deprives the candidates who are eligible for the post, from being considered. A person employed in violation of these provisions is not entitled to any relief including salary. For a valid and legal appointment mandatory compliance with the said constitutional requirement is to be fulfilled. The equality clause enshrined in Article 16 requires that every such appointment be made by an open advertisement as to enable all eligible persons to compete on merit.

The above said judgment has been quoted with approval by the Supreme Court in **Renu and Others vs. District & Sessions Judge, Tis Hazari and another [AIR 2014 SC 2175]** vide judgment dated 12.02.2014.

12.1. The appointment orders of the petitioners clearly indicate that the petitioners were appointed temporarily against the vacancy. The appointment of petitioners on the basis of the list made by the employment exchange cannot be held as in accordance with constitutional scheme of employment. The constitutional scheme of employment requires public notification, inviting applications from all eligible candidates including candidates referred to by the employment exchange. Thus, it cannot be held that the appointment of the petitioners was in accordance with the constitutional scheme of employment.

12.2. The Supreme Court in **State of Karnataka v. Umadevi (3) [(2006) 4 SCC 1]** held as under :

"44. The concept of "equal pay for equal work" is different from the concept of conferring permanency on those who have been appointed on ad hoc basis, temporary basis, or based on no process of selection as envisaged by the rules. This Court has in various decisions applied the principle of equal pay for equal work and has laid down the parameters for the application of that principle. The decisions are rested on the concept of equality enshrined in our



Constitution in the light of the directive principles in that behalf. But the acceptance of that principle cannot lead to a position where the court could direct that appointments made without following the due procedure established by law, be deemed permanent or issue directions to treat them as permanent. Doing so, would be negation of the principle of equality of opportunity. The power to make an order as is necessary for doing complete justice in any cause or matter pending before this Court, would not normally be used for giving the go-by to the procedure established by law in the matter of public employment. Take the situation arising in the cases before us from the State of Karnataka. Therein, after *Dharwad decision* the Government had issued repeated directions and mandatory orders that no temporary or ad hoc employment or engagement be given. Some of the authorities and departments had ignored those directions or defied those directions and had continued to give employment, specifically interdicted by the orders issued by the executive. Some of the appointing officers have even been punished for their defiance. It would not be just or proper to pass an order in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 or 32 of the Constitution or in exercise of power under Article 142 of the Constitution permitting those persons engaged, to be absorbed or to be made permanent, based on their appointments or engagements. Complete justice would be justice according to law and though it would be open to this Court to mould the relief, this Court would not grant a relief which would amount to perpetuating an illegality.

45. While directing that appointments, temporary or casual, be regularised or made permanent, the courts are swayed by the fact that the person concerned has worked for some time and in some cases for a considerable length of time. It is not as if the person who accepts an engagement either temporary or casual in nature, is not aware of the nature of his employment. He accepts the employment with open eyes. It may be true that he is not in a position to bargain—not at arm's length—since he might have been searching for some employment so as to eke out his livelihood and accepts whatever he gets. But on that ground alone, it would not be appropriate to jettison the constitutional scheme of appointment and to take the view that a person who has temporarily or casually got employed should be directed to be continued permanently. By doing so, it will be creating another mode of public appointment which is



not permissible. If the court were to void a contractual employment of this nature on the ground that the parties were not having equal bargaining power, that too would not enable the court to grant any relief to that employee. A total embargo on such casual or temporary employment is not possible, given the exigencies of administration and if imposed, would only mean that some people who at least get employment temporarily, contractually or casually, would not be getting even that employment when securing of such employment brings at least some succour to them. After all, innumerable citizens of our vast country are in search of employment and one is not compelled to accept a casual or temporary employment if one is not inclined to go in for such an employment. It is in that context that one has to proceed on the basis that the employment was accepted fully knowing the nature of it and the consequences flowing from it. In other words, even while accepting the employment, the person concerned knows the nature of his employment. It is not an appointment to a post in the real sense of the term. The claim acquired by him in the post in which he is temporarily employed or the interest in that post cannot be considered to be of such a magnitude as to enable the giving up of the procedure established, for making regular appointments to available posts in the services of the State. The argument that since one has been working for some time in the post, it will not be just to discontinue him, even though he was aware of the nature of the employment when he first took it up, is not one that would enable the jettisoning of the procedure established by law for public employment and would have to fail when tested on the touchstone of constitutionality and equality of opportunity enshrined in Article 14 of the Constitution.

47. When a person enters a temporary employment or gets engagement as a contractual or casual worker and the engagement is not based on a proper selection as recognised by the relevant rules or procedure, he is aware of the consequences of the appointment being temporary, casual or contractual in nature. Such a person cannot invoke the theory of legitimate expectation for being confirmed in the post when an appointment to the post could be made only by following a proper procedure for selection and in cases concerned, in consultation with the Public Service Commission. Therefore, the theory of legitimate expectation cannot be successfully advanced by temporary, contractual or casual



employees. It cannot also be held that the State has held out any promise while engaging these persons either to continue them where they are or to make them permanent. The State cannot constitutionally make such a promise. It is also obvious that the theory cannot be invoked to seek a positive relief of being made permanent in the post.

54. It is also clarified that those decisions which run counter to the principle settled in this decision, or in which directions running counter to what we have held herein, will stand denuded of their status as precedents."

12.3. The Supreme Court in **State of Rajasthan Vs. Daya Lal [(2011) 2 SCC 429]**, held as under :

"12. We may at the outset refer to the following well-settled principles relating to regularisation and parity in pay, relevant in the context of these appeals:

(i) The High Courts, in exercising power under Article 226 of the Constitution will not issue directions for regularisation, absorption or permanent continuance, unless the employees claiming regularisation had been appointed in pursuance of a regular recruitment in accordance with relevant rules in an open competitive process, against sanctioned vacant posts. The equality clause contained in Articles 14 and 16 should be scrupulously followed and Courts should not issue a direction for regularisation of services of an employee which would be violative of the constitutional scheme. While something that is irregular for want of compliance with one of the elements in the process of selection which does not go to the root of the process, can be regularised, back door entries, appointments contrary to the constitutional scheme and/or appointment of ineligible candidates cannot be regularised.

(ii) Mere continuation of service by a temporary or ad hoc or daily-wage employee, under cover of some interim orders of the court, would not confer upon him any right to be absorbed into service, as such service would be "litigious employment". Even temporary, ad hoc or daily-wage service for a long number of years, let alone service for one or two years, will not entitle such employee to claim regularisation, if he is not working against a



sanctioned post. Sympathy and sentiment cannot be grounds for passing any order of regularisation in the absence of a legal right."

12.4. In view of the well settled provisions of law as discussed hereinabove and the factual matrix involved in the case on hand, no direction can be issued to regularise the services of the petitioners and continue them on the basis of their continuity of service upon their appointment till date. Further, none of the grounds raised by the petitioners in the affidavits are tenable. As such, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the orders impugned in some of these writ petitions.

13. At this juncture, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners were originally appointed to maintain the vehicles purchased under JNNURM scheme for Solid Waste Management System, on daily wage basis and the said scheme is extended upto 31.03.2017 vide G.O.No.399, MAWS Department, dated 21.09.2016; the working pattern, nature and other ancillary assistance required therefor would be known well to the petitioners and there would always be regular and continuous work. The learned counsel also submitted that, apart from the grounds, Rules and Acts raised in these writ petitions, the petitioners have additional grounds in their favour and hence submitted that they may be permitted to prefer representations to the respondents, for which course of action, the learned Special Government Pleader submitted that, if such representations are received, they will be considered in accordance with law.

14. In view of the said submission, considering the theory of legitimate expectation and considering the fact that the petitioners are working for more than five years, this Court is of the view that a duty is cast upon the respondents to review their orders impugned herein by considering the plight of the petitioners, if they are otherwise found eligible.

15. In view of the above, the petitioners are directed to prefer representations along with supportive documents to the respondents herein, in line with the Government Orders / Standing Rules / Rules (apart from the Rules or Acts raised in these writ petitions, if any), in their favour, to consider their claim, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The respondents, on receipt of such representation from the petitioners shall consider the same and pass appropriate orders, on merits and in accordance with their own scheme and law and also in the light of the Judgments decided on the subject, within a period of four weeks thereafter. However, it is made clear that this order will not prevent the respondents from considering the case of the petitioner while filling up the post of Drivers or any other posts, as and when vacancy arises



16. With the above observations and directions, all the writ petitions are disposed of. No costs. Consequently, the connected WMPs are closed.

WEB COPY

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

// True Copy //

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

mj / srk

To:

- 1.The Secretary to Government,
Municipal Administration and
Water Supply Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St. George, Chennai - 9.
- 2.The Director of Municipal Administration,
Chepauk, Chennai - 5.
- 3.The Commissioner of Corporation,
Madurai Corporation,
Madurai.
- 4.The Assistant Commissioner,
Madurai Corporation,
Madurai.

1CC TO M/S.VEERA ASSOCIATES, ADVOCATES SR 62963

1CC TO MR. R. MURALI, ADVOCATE SR 62858

14P 7C

order made in
W.P(MD)Nos.3444 and 3445, 953 to 969,
823 to 834, 1868 to 1874, 2549 and
2550, 2202, 2203 and 2206 of 2017

14.06.2019