



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16.07.2021

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.SANJIB BANERJEE, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

W.P.No.10033 of 2021

J.Ganessin

.. Petitioner-in-Person

vs

The Registrar (Vigilance)
High Court of Judicature at Madras
Chennai - 600 104.

.. Respondent

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ of mandamus to direct the respondent to take appropriate action on petitioner's complaint dated 22.4.2018 and to protect in H.R.C.O.P.No.21 of 2010 in addition to H.R.C.E.P.No.5 of 2011 pending before the Rent Controller (Principal District Munsif) at Puducherry.

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Ganessin
Petitioner-in-person

For Respondent : Mr.B.Vijay

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by the Hon'ble Chief Justice)

Pursuant to the previous directions, a status report has been filed by the Registrar-General of this Court.



2. It appears from such status report that the petitioner carries a grievance in respect of a tenancy dispute in which the petitioner is involved. The petitioner filed an eviction petition against one B.Vaithiyanathan before the Rent Controller, Puducherry, seeking eviction on the ground of willful default of payment of rent and for personal occupation under Section 10 of the Pondicherry Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Act, 1969, which was decreed exparte. The petitioner sought to execute the decree to obtain possession. The tenant applied for setting aside the exparte decree and also questioned the executability thereof.

3. The status report details the progress of the proceedings thereafter and concludes that the apprehension expressed by the petitioner of records being tampered is completely without basis.

4. The necessary documents and copy-papers have been appended to the status report. The matter appears no more than a desperate attempt by a litigant to question the process upon having failed to obtain orders to the litigant's liking in proceedings instituted by such litigant.

5. The petitioner as advocate should know better.

6. While it cannot be denied that in some cases extraneous considerations appear to weigh with judges who are required to be impartial while adjudicating matters, there is an increasing trend for advocates and litigants to level baseless allegations against judges merely because the order may have gone against them. Oftentimes, these allegations and the time spent in scrutinising the same and inquiring thereinto impede the administration of justice.

7. In the instant case, the status report does not reveal that the adjudicating process was procedurally flawed or that any document or order or court record had been manipulated or tampered with or altered to the detriment or prejudice of the petitioner.

8. Notwithstanding this order, it will be open to the petitioner to pursue any other appropriate remedy available to the petitioner in respect of the orders by which the petitioner may be aggrieved. However, no further writ petition or complaint pertaining to the perceived irregularities in the



conduct of the matter will be entertained.

W.P.No.10033 of 2021 is disposed of without any order as to costs. Consequently, W.M.P.No.10664 of 2021 is closed.

WEB COPY

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS)

//True Copy//
Sub Assistant Registrar

sasi

To

The Registrar (Vigilance)
High Court of Judicature at Madras
Chennai - 600 104.

+1cc to M/S.J.Ganessin, Advocate, S.R.No.33785
+1cc to M/S.J.Ganessin, Advocate, S.R.No.33785 (23/07/2021)

W.P.No.10033 of 2021

SSN(CO)
SU(22/07/2021)