



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.07.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.MAHADEVAN

Writ Petition No.25998 of 2013

N. Janakiraman

... Petitioner

Versus

1.The District Collector
District Collector Office
Tiruvannamalai District.

2.Block Development Officer
Anakkavur BDO office
Anakkavur, Cheyyar Taluk

3.Manickam

4.Bhaskaran

... Respondents

(R3 and R4 were impleaded as per order
dated 09.10.2013 made in M.P.No.1/2013
in W.P.No.25998 of 2013)

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 2nd respondent to dispose of the petitioner's representation dated 09.07.2013.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Panchatsaram

For R1 : Mr.Stalin Abimanyu
Government Advocate

For R3 : Mr.K.B.Arul

R2 and R4 : Dismissed vide order of this Court
dated 15.12.2014 for non-payment of batta

ORDER

The prayer made in this writ petition is to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 2nd respondent to dispose of the petitioner's representation dated 09.07.2013 for taking action



against the respondents 3 and 4.

2. The petitioner claims himself to be an Advocate practising in the Courts at Cheyyar, Tiruvannamalai District. It is claimed by the petitioner that the fourth and fifth respondents have indulged in several malpractices in the matter of disbursement of amount to the workers engaged in 100 days employment guarantee scheme. He also would contend that the fourth and fifth respondents, with the help of his men, have cut and carried away various trees in Cheyyar and sold it to exorbitant rate and thereby enriched themselves. In this regard, the petitioner has given a complaint by way of a representation dated 09.07.2013 and it was forwarded to the second respondent for causing an enquiry. However, the second respondent did not taken any action and therefore, he is before this Court with this writ petition.

3. Today, when this writ petition is taken up for consideration, the learned Government Advocate for the 1st respondent on instructions, submitted that the third and fourth respondents herein, against whom the petitioner has given a complaint have held the post of President of Panchayat and Writer in the Village Panchayat and in their capacity, they have done certain acts, against which the petitioner has submitted the representation dated 09.07.2013. Now, the third and fourth respondents are no longer holding the post in the Village Panchayat. Further, the representation was given on 09.07.2013 and at this stage, nothing survives for consideration by this Court.

4. There is no representation for the petitioner. The representation was given on 09.07.2013 to the respondents 1 and 2 alleging certain acts of abuse and misuse of power by the respondents 3 and 4. It is stated that the respondents 3 and 4 are no longer working as Panchayat/Writer in the Village Panchayat. While so, at this length of time, the relief sought for by the petitioner cannot be granted. The writ petition is therefore dismissed. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS IV)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

kj/rsh



To

1. The District Collector
District Collector Office
Tiruvannamalai District.

2. Block Development Officer
Anakkavur BDO office
Anakkavur, Cheyyar Taluk

+lcc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.35591

WP No. 25998 of 2013

PCH (CO)
CT(17/09/2021)