



W.P(MD)No.4878 of 2019

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 15.12.2022

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

W.P(MD)No.4878 of 2019

S.A.Seyeed

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Union of India,
Rep. by the Secretary,
Ministry of Civil Aviation,
Rajiv Gandhi Bhavan,
Safdarjung Airport Area,
Vasanth Vihar,
New Delhi-57.
- 2.The Director,,
Airport Authority of India,
Tiruchirappalli International Airport,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 3.Scott Tigerair Pvt Ltd.,,
Rep by its Manager,
Tiruchirappalli International Airport,
Tiruchirappalli.
- 4.Singapore Airlines Gargo Pvt Ltd.,
Rep. by its Manager,
Tiruchirappalli International Airport,
Tiruchirappalli -7.
- 5.AMZ Logistics Solutions Pvt Ltd.,
Rep. by its Manager,
Office at Unit No. 001,



W.P(MD)No.4878 of 2019

Omega Wing, Raheja Towers,
N.No. 177, Anna Salai, Chennai-2.

... Respondents

WEB COPY

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the 2nd respondent to consider the petitioner's representation dated 24.11.2018 as per law and take action against 4th and 5th respondent for GSA License violation in Tiruchirappalli International Airport.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.S.Sivaram

For Respondents : Mr.K.Prabhu,
Central Govt. Standing Counsel for R1.
Mr.C.Godwin for R2.
Mr.M.Sridhar for R4.
Mr.R.Ramadurai for R5.

ORDER

Heard the learned counsel on either side.

2.The petitioner has given a representation dated 24.11.2018 to the respondents 1 and 2 for taking action against the fifth respondent. Since it was not considered, the present writ petition has been filed.



W.P(MD)No.4878 of 2019

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner reiterated all the contentions set out in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition and called upon this Court to issue direction as prayed for.

4.The respondents have filed their respective counter affidavits and I have been taken by the learned respective counsels through their contents.

5.After hearing the learned counsel on either side and on going through the materials on record, I am more than satisfied that the petitioner's rights have not been affected in any manner. The petitioner appears to be aggrieved by the appointment of the fifth respondent to handle the cargo of the fourth respondent. This is a matter entirely between the fourth respondent and fifth respondent. The learned standing counsel for Airport authority has also clarified that they have no role at all in the matter. I am therefore satisfied that no case for issuing direction to consider the petitioner's request has been made out. The writ stands dismissed. No costs.

15.12.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes/ No
ias



WEB COPY



W.P(MD)No.4878 of 2019

G.R.SWAMINATHAN, J.

ias

W.P(MD)No.4878 of 2019

15.12.2022