



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.11.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M.SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.30271 of 2011

S.Ramasamy

...Petitioner

Vs

The Commissioner
Thiruchirapalli Corporation
Trichy 620 001.

...Respondent

PRAYER : Writ Petition filed Under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondent herein to settle the professional fees pending sanction and payment from the respondent herein in favour of the petitioner as per the claim bills sent to the respondent and the letter dated 24.11.2011 with interest at the rate of 18% per annum.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Rajkumar

For Respondent : Mr.P.Srinivas

O R D E R

This writ petition has been filed for a direction directing the respondent to settle the professional fees pending sanction and payment from the respondent in favour of the petitioner as per the claim bills sent to the respondent and letter dated 24.11.2011 with interest at the rate of 18% per annum.

2.The petitioner is a practicing Advocate before the High Court of Judicature at Madras and various other Courts and Tribunals from 1972 onwards. The Petitioner was appointed as Additional Advocate General-II of the State of Tamil Nadu and was designated as Senior Advocate and later on 25.09.2009, he was appointed as Additional Advocate General-I.

3.The grievances of the writ petitioner is that the professional fees due to the petitioner are yet to be settled by the Respondent. Thus, the Petitioner is constrained to move the present writ petition.



4.Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Writ Petitioner made a submission that some of the bills were already cleared and one bill amounting to Rs.30,000/- is yet to be settled i.e. 02/2007 dated 21.02.2007 W.P. (MD) Nos. 47803 & 10660 of 2006.

WEB COPY

5.Mr. P.Srinivas, Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Respondent/ Thiruchirapalli Corporation made a submission that the said bill amounting to Rs.30,000/- is not settled, in view of the fact that the petitioner /Senior Counsel had not argued the matter in the said writ petitions. In fact, he appeared for the Government and not for the Corporation. In view of the fact that the petitioner/ Senior Counsel had not appeared for the Corporation in the above writ petitions, the bill in issue has not been settled.

6.This Court is of the considered opinion that a specific stand has been taken by the Respondent /Corporation that the Petitioner had not appeared in the above mentioned writ petitions defending the Corporation. Thus is no reason to consider the relief as sought for in the present writ petition.

7.Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-IX)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

Maya

To

The Commissioner
Thiruchirapalli Corporation
Trichy 620 001.

+1cc to Mr.Yuvaraj, Advocate, S.R.No.57341

W.P.No.30271 of 2011

SSD(CO)
RGA(26/11/2021)