



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : **23.04.2021**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J.NISHA BANU

W.P(MD)No.15709 of 2013

S.Parasuraman

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Textile Commissioner,
Minister of Textiles,
Powerloom Development Cell,
P.B.No.11500, New Marine Line,
Government of India, Mumbai - 20.

2.The General Manager,
The Tamilnadu Industrial Investment
Corporation Ltd., 692, Anna Salai,
Nandanam, Chennai - 35.

3.The Branch Manager,
The Tamilnadu Industrial Investment
Corporation Ltd.,
100, Railway Feeder Road,
Virudhunagar.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 1st respondent to release the 20% subsidy of the loan amount in favour of the petitioner and consequently to direct the 2nd respondent to grant the same amount to the petitioner through 3rd respondent.

For Petitioner : No Appearance

For Respondent-1 : Mr.P.Subbiah

O R D E R

This Writ Petition has been filed praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the 1st respondent to release 20% subsidy of the loan amount in favour of the petitioner and consequently, to direct the 2nd respondent to grant the same amount to the petitioner, through the 3rd respondent.

2. There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. The learned counsel for the 1st respondent is present.

3. When the matter is taken up for hearing, the learned counsel appearing for the 1st respondent would submit that even prior to filing of the Writ Petition, the petitioner's request has been rejected by the 1st respondent, vide proceedings No.2(66)/1977/024/111/2007-08/PDC/61, dated 15.02.2008, which is enclosed in



the typed set of papers filed by the petitioner. Instead of challenging the said order of the 1st respondent, dated 15.02.2008, the petitioner has simply filed the present Writ Petition for a Mandamus, which is not maintainable and liable to be dismissed.

4. I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

5. On perusal of the records it is seen that the 1st respondent vide his proceedings, dated 15.02.2008, rejected the request of the petitioner to release 20% subsidy of the loan amount in his favour. As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the 1st respondent, instead of challenging the said order of the 1st respondent, dated 15.02.2008, the petitioner has filed the present Writ Petition for a Mandamus and therefore, the same is dismissed as misconceived.

6. In fine, this Writ Petition is dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CS-II)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

MPK

Note:(i) In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

+1 CC to M/s.P.SUBBIAH, Advocate (SR-17496[F] dated 26/04/2021)

W.P (MD) No.15709 of 2013
23.04.2021

RK(12.05.2021) 2P 2C