

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15.03.2021

CORAM: JUSTICE N.SESHASAYEE

W.P.Nos.6536, 6537, 6539, 6542 & 6543 of 2021

- 1.Malini Devi ...Petitioner in W.P.No.6536 of 2021
- 2.Anuradha ...Petitioner in W.P.No.6537 of 2021
- 3.S.Palanivelu ...Petitioner in W.P.No.6539 of 2021
- 4.S.Kumaresan ...Petitioner in W.P.No.6542 of 2021
- 5.V.Gugan ...Petitioner in W.P.No.6543 of 2021

-Vs-

The Inspector General of Registration,
Registrar General Office,
No.100, Santhome High Road,
Santhome, Chennai 600 028. ...Respondent in all W.Ps

Prayer in all W.Ps: Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondent herein to consider the representation of the petitioners dated, 19.02.2021, 19.02.2021, 19.02.2021, 25.02.2021& 18.02.2021 respectively.

In all W.Ps

For Petitioners : Mr.H.Raveen Maria Henry

For Respondent : Mr.T.M.Pappiah, SGP

COMMON ORDER

These Writ Petitions are filed for a writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondent herein to consider the representation of the petitioners dated 18.02.2021, 19.02.2021 and 25.02.2021 respectively.

2. The petitioners herein have applied for stamp-vendor's license. The last date for filing this application was 12.02.2021. One of the enclosures that should accompany such application is a solvency certificate. None of the petitioners have produced solvency certificate along with their applications, but, have produced the same on 18.02.2021, which is after the last date for filing the application.

3. In the mean time, the Department began issuing call letters for interviewing the potential candidates for issuance of stamp-vendor's license. Since none of the petitioners herein have received the call letter, they have filed separate representations dated 18.02.2021, 19.02.2021 and 25.02.2021, with a prayer to invite them for an interview.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that while the last date for application has been stipulated, there is no outer time limit fixed for production of solvency certificate. Therefore, the petitioners ought to be called for the interview.

5. Mr.T.M.Pappiah, learned Special Government Pleader who took notice for the respondent, made a statement on instruction that a completed application form includes production of every document that is required to be enclosed. The petitioners herein admittedly have not produced the solvency certificate along with their application, and obviously their application cannot merit consideration.

6.1 This Court finds a considerable force in the submission of the learned Special Government Pleader. The petitioners' applications are incomplete, since they did not comply with the mandatory requirement of producing the solvency certificate. Even otherwise, the petitioners herein have not demonstrated, if they have any vested right for calling them for interview nor have been to show if the authorities have been arbitrary in 'breaching' the equality-doctrine.

6.2 They being the defaulters at the first instance and they being neither vested right for calling them for interview demonstrated, nor have they been able to establish how they are discriminated against, this Court cannot say there exists a cause of action for giving a direction.

7. In conclusion, this Court does not find merit in any of the petitions and the same are dismissed. It is open to the petitioners to workout such other option available to them in law, if they are so advised. No costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS-VII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

gsk

To

The Inspector General of Registration,
Registrar General Office,
No.100, Santhome High Road,
Santhome, Chennai 600 028.

+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.16905

W.P.Nos.6536, 6537, 6539,
6542 & 6543 of 2021

GPL(CO)
CB(28/04/2021)



WEB COPY