



3. It is the stand of the petitioner that, the earlier notice dated 03.09.2012 fixing the date of hearing as 05.09.2012 itself was served on the petitioner on 15.09.2012. Therefore, there was no chance for the petitioner to appear in the enquiry on 05.09.2012 and therefore, that reason cannot be stated for passing the impugned order.

5. The learned counsel for the second respondent, on instructions, would submit that, subsequently during the pendency of the writ petition, the second respondent filed RCOP proceedings and the said petition was ordered. Accordingly, in the year 2019 itself, eviction order was passed and the petitioner has vacated the premises and he is no more residing in the premises and therefore, the question of challenging the impugned order does not arise and virtually the prayer sought for in the writ petition has become infructuous, he contended.

7. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, by taking into account the subsequent development, where the petitioner himself has vacated the premises in question, as has been rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the second respondent, nothing survives in the writ petition, as the very impugned order dated 02.10.2012 itself has become infructuous insofar as the petitioner is concerned, therefore, recording these developments, this writ petition is dismissed as no further orders are required to be passed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar (CS-VI)

Sub Assistant Registrar

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



To

The Zonal Officer
Corporation of Chennai Zone-15
Sholinganallur, Chennai - 119.

W.P.No. 10281 of 2014

PVS (CO)
GMY (31/01/2022)