



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 16.12.2020

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.R. SWAMINATHAN

Rev.Apl.W(MD)No.42 of 2020

and

W.M.P. (MD)No.13342 of 2020

in

WP(MD)No.12807 of 2020

Maduraiveeran

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The District Collector,
Trichy,
Trichy District.

2.The Commissioner,
Tiruchirappalli City Municipal Corporation,
Tiruchirappalli City Municipal Corporation Building,
Trichy.

3.The Assistant Commissioner,
Tiruchirappalli City Municipal Corporation,
Tiruchirappalli City Municipal Corporation Building,
Trichy.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Order 47 Rule 1 of C.P.C., praying to review the order dated 01.10.2020 made in W.P.(MD)No.12807 of 2020.

Prayer in WP(MD). 12807 of 2020 :

Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ or Order or Direction directing the 1st and 2nd respondents to allot and accommodate the Petitioner in the 9th shop for which Bid/Auction was not conducted on 08.05.2020 pursuant to the Notice dt 30.04.2020 of the 2nd respondent in the new fish market at Kozhumani Road, Woraiyur by considering and passing of the appropriate orders on the representation dt 09.05.2020 of the petitioner.

For Petitioner	:Mr.K.Hemakarthikeyan
For R1	:Mr.M.Rajarajan Additional Government Pleader
For R2 & R3	:Mr.Sajibino Standing Counsel

ORDER

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the review petitioner,
learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the first
<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



respondent and the learned Standing Counsel appearing for the respondent Corporation.

2.The case of the review petitioner is that he had been carrying on business in the old fish market and that, he had been denied the allotment in the newly constructed fish market. The petitioner had earlier filed W.P.(MD)No.12807 of 2020. The said writ petition was taken up by me along with the other writ petitions. All these writ petitions were given a disposal by recording the submission of the learned Standing Counsel for the respondent Corporation that their cases will be considered, when the market is expanded. The said order is sought to be reviewed by the petitioner who contended that he has been enjoying the shop in the old fish market.

3.The learned Standing Counsel categorically stated that only those persons, who were direct licensees or lessees under the Corporation in the old fish market, have been allotted the shops. According to the learned Standing Counsel, the petitioner was not a direct licensee. He was only running his business as private licensee.

4.When the Court called upon the petitioner's counsel to produce proof to show that he was a direct licensee under the Corporation, when he was running his business in the old fish market, the learned counsel for the petitioner fairly stated that he was not a direct licensee. Therefore, I do not find any ground to entertain the review petition. The review petition stands dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AE)

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

Rmi

To
The District Collector,
Trichy,
Trichy District.

+1 CC to SPL GP (SR-26100[F] dated 17/12/2020)

Rev.Apl.W(MD)No.42 of 2020 and
W.M.P. (MD)No.13342 of 2020 in
WP (MD)No.12807 of 2020

16.12.2020

VB (29.12.2020) 2P 3C

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>