

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

ORDER RESERVED ON : 30.09.2022

ORDER PRONOUNCED ON : 20.10.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

W.P.(MD).Nos.10489, 13026 and 13027 of 2015

and

MP(MD).Nos.2 & 3 of 2015,

WMP(MD).Nos.2150 & 5411 of 2016 and MP(MD).Nos.1 to 3 of 2015,

WMP(MD).No.2145 of 2016 and MP(MD).Nos.1 & 2 of 2015 and

WMP(MD).No.2146 of 2016

WP(MD).No.10489 of 2015:

Therur Thenkumari Inland Fisherman
Co-operative Society Limited No.F.N.L-9
Represented by the President
V.Arumugam

....Petitioner

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

2.The Secretary to Government
Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

3.The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

4.The Executive Engineer
Public Works Department, Water Resources Organisation
Kodayar Basin Division
Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District

5.The Thasildar
Agasteeswaram Taluk
Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District

6.The Deputy Director of Fisheries (Regional)
Distillery Road, Vadaseri, Nagercoil
Kanyakumari District

....Respondents

(R4 to R6 are impleaded vide order dated 05.08.2019)

WP(MD).No.13026 of 2015:

The Kanyakumari District Fishermen
Co-operative Federation Limited No.Y-23
Represented by its Chairman
E.Iyappan @ Sahayam

....Petitioner

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Principal Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

2.The Secretary to Government
Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

3.The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

4.The Executive Engineer
Kodayar Basin Irrigation System
Water Resources Organisation
Public Works Department
Nagercoil

5.The Assistant Engineer
Water Resources Organisation
Public Works Department
Pattanamkal Section
Kuzhithurai
Kanyakumari District

6.The Tashildar
Kalkulam Taluk
Thuckalay
Kanyakumari District

.....Respondents

WP(MD).No.13027 of 2015:
F(K.K) 1 Thovalai Taluk Inland
Fishermen Co-operative Society Ltd.,
Represented by its President
E.Iyappan @ Sayaham

.....Petitioner

Vs

1.The State of Tamil Nadu
Represented by its Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

2.The Secretary to Government
Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

3.The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

4.The Executive Engineer
Kodayar Basin Irrigation System
Water Resources Organisation
Public Works Department
Nagercoil

5.The Thasildar
Thovalai Taluk
Bhoothapandi
Kanyakumari District

....Respondents

Prayer in W.P(MD).No.10489 of 2015 : This Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records passed by the first respondent in Government Orders in G.O.Ms.No.16, Public Works (W2) Department dated 14.01.2011 and G.O.Ms.No.72, Public Works (W2) Department dated 06.05.2014 and also the consequential proceedings in letter No.Tha1/2181/2014/dated 11/02/2015 passed by the 4th respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to implement the Government Order in G.O.Ms.No.332, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries (FS-IV) Department dated 17/11/1993 effectively.

(Prayer amended vide order dated 05.08.2019)

Prayer in W.P(MD).No.13026 of 2015: This Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records passed by the first respondent in Government Orders in G.O.Ms.No.16, Public Works (W2) Department dated 14.01.2011 and G.O.Ms.No.72, Public Works (W2) Department dated 06.05.2014 by the first respondent and the consequent letter by the 4th respondent vide letter No.Tha1/2181/214/dated 11/02/2015 and the auction notice by the 5th respondent vide Letter No.27/2015 dated 14.07.2015 with regard to Kalkulam Taluk, Kanyakumair District, quash the same and consequently to

direct the respondents to implement G.O.Ms.No.332, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries (FS-IV) Department dated 17.11.1993 issued by the second respondent effectively.

Prayer in W.P(MD).No.13027 of 2015: This Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of G.O.Ms.No.15, Public Works (W2) Department dated 14.01.2011 and G.O.Ms.No.72, Public Works (W2) Department dated 06.05.2014 by the first respondent and the consequent letter by the 4th respondent vide letter No.Tha1/2181/214/dated 11/02/2015, quash the same and consequently to direct the respondents to implement G.O.Ms.No.332, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries (FS-IV) Department dated 17.11.1993 issued by the second respondent effectively.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Ajmal Khan
Senior Counsel
For Mr.C.T.Perumal
in WP.Nos.13026 & 13027 of 2015

: Mr.D.Srinivasaragavan
For Mrs.Padmavathy
in WP.No.10489 of 2015

For Respondents : Mr.Veera Kathiravan
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.B.Saravanan,
Additional Government Pleader
in all the petitions

COMMON ORDER

The present writ petitions have been filed by 3 Fishermen Co-operative Societies registered under the Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1983.

2.All the writ petitions have been filed challenging G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011 and G.O.Ms.No.72, dated 06.05.2014 and a consequential letter issued by the Executive Engineer of the Public Works Department dated 07.02.2015.

3.In WP(MD).No.13026 of 2015, an auction notice dated 14.07.2015 issued by the Assistant Engineer of Water Resources Organisation, Public Works Department, Kuzhithurai is also under challenge.

4.The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the writ petitioners in WP(MD).Nos.13026 and 13027 of 2015 has contended as follows:

(i). The petitioners are registered Co-operative Societies under Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1983. The members of the said Society are fishermen of the locality. As per Revenue Standing Order No.211, fishing rights in a particular Tank within the jurisdiction of the Co-operative Societies should be granted by way of lease in favour of members of Co-operative Societies. Only if the Co-operative Society is not willing to take up the lease, the question of going for a public auction will arise.

(ii). The learned Senior Counsel had stated that the Revenue Standing Order No.211 was further confirmed by issuance of G.O.Ms.No.332, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries (FS-IV) Department dated 17.11.1993. Under the said G.O, the Government has confirmed that RSO.No.211 is still in vogue and will continue to operate in future. As per the said Government Order, the

fisheries lease shall be granted for a period of 5 years and annual lease should not be resorted to. He had further pointed out that the Collector is the authority for granting such lease in respect of the Tanks under his control. The learned Senior Counsel had further contended that the said Government Order by Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Department was issued with the concurrence of the Public Works Department, Revenue Department and Financial Department. The Government has neither cancelled nor superseded the said Government Order.

(iii). The learned Senior Counsel had further contended that the Government has passed the impugned G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011. As per Clause 4(iv) of the said G.O, a complete ban has been imposed as against the conduct of public auction for fishery rights by the individual and certain organisations. This Government order has not superseded G.O.Ms.No.332 which was issued with concurrence of the Public Works Department. A consequential impugned Government Order in G.O.Ms.No.72 dated 06.05.2014 has been issued for creating separate head of accounts for depositing the amount collected through the public auction of the fishery rights.

(iv).The learned Senior Counsel had further contended that G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011 is misinterpreted by the authorities and they have proceeded to pass an order on 11.02.2015 under which it has been

clarified that the lease should not be granted to the individual or any Society which would be considered to be an illegal Act. Hence, according to the learned Senior Counsel, G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011 has been misinterpreted by the authorities and an order has been passed on 11.02.2015 which is also impugned in the present writ petition. He had further contended that relying upon G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011, an auction notice has been issued by the fifth respondent in W.P(MD).No.13026 of 2015. As per the said public auction notice, fishery rights have to be publicly auctioned. The impugned auction notice does not reflect any preference in favour of the fishermen Co-operative Societies which is contemplated in Revenue Standing Order No.211 and G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993. Hence, he contended that 11.02.2015 order and the impugned auction notice should also be set aside and they should be directed to lease out the fishing rights in favour of the fishermen Co-operative Societies without conducting any public auction as contemplated under G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993.

(v).The learned Senior Counsel had further contended that when RSO.No.211 and G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993 have not been superseded or cancelled by the Government, they are duty bound to implement the said executive instructions and grant preferential rights to the fishermen Co-operative Societies. As long as the said Government orders are in force, the respondent authorities are duty bound to implement and follow the same

and should not go in for a public auction in all the cases where fishermen Co-operative Societies are willing to take up lease.

(vi).The learned Senior Counsel had further contended that if the individual and the third parties are permitted to participate in a public auction, they will only escalate the price in view of the fact that ultimate auction is going to be conferred based upon the preferential rights in favour of the fishermen Co-operative Societies. Hence, by conducting public auction, the upset price cannot be fixed by the Government.

(vii). The learned Senior Counsel had further contended that the order of the Hon'ble Division Bench in WA(MD).Nos.1251 and 923 of 2020 dated 03.02.2021 is confined only to a particular Fishermen Co-operative Society. The said order is not applicable to all the fishermen Co-operative Societies. He had further contended that the reference in Paragraph No.10 that the highest offer by successful bidder will have to be offered to the fishermen Societies and it is better to follow this methodology in all future cases, is only a passing reference and the same is not the ratio in the said judgment.

(viii). The learned Senior Counsel had further contended that as long as Revenue Standing Order No.211 and G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993 are in force, the officials of the State are bound to follow the same. The State is always at liberty to take a different policy decision and it should be reflected by way of Government Order. The State cannot rely upon the Hon'ble

Division Bench Judgement of High Court in WA(MD).Nos.1251 and 932 of 2020 dated 03.02.2021 and contended that they have accepted the Division Bench Judgement and hereafter, they would follow the process of conducting public auction for auctioning the fishery rights.

(ix).The learned Senior Counsel had further contended that none of the orders passed either by the Hon'ble Division Bench or by the learned Single Judge of this Court have directed to take away the preferential rights in favour of the fishermen Co-operative Societies. Hence, these judgements have only confirmed the policy decision of the Government as reflected in RSO No.211 and G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993. These two executive directions have not been set aside by the Court. Only with regard to the upset price, the Hon'ble Division Bench in WA(MD).Nos.1251 and 923 of 2020 dated 03.02.2021 had found that the upset price with regard to Co-operative Fishing Society could be based upon the highest bid in a public auction. Hence, according to the learned Senior Counsel, the Government orders impugned in the writ petitions and a consequential order passed by the concerned authorities imposing a complete ban on leasing out of tanks in favour of the Co-operative Fishing Societies is illegal, ultra virus and unsustainable in law and hence, it is liable to be set aside.

5. Contentions of the learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents:

(i). The learned Additional Advocate General has contended that in RSO No.211 and in G.O.Ms.332 dated 17.11.1993, though a preference has been conferred upon the fishermen Co-operative Societies in granting lease in their favour, the Government has taken a policy decision to accept and follow the judgement of the Hon'ble Division Bench in WA(MD).Nos.1251 and 923 of 2020 dated 03.02.2021.

(ii).The learned Additional Advocate General had further contended that the said policy decision has been taken on the ground that this results in augmentation of income of the Government which in turn results in augmentation of income of the farmers' association who are entitled to receive 50% of the auction proceeds.

(iii).The learned Additional Advocate General had further contended that RSO No.211 and G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993 which are relied upon by the writ petitioner are only an executive instruction and the Government is always at liberty to take a policy decision and take a different view by accepting the Judgement of the Hon'ble Division Bench. He had further contended that the resources of the State, cannot be granted for a paltry sum to be paid by the Co-operative Societies when the individuals are ready to offer more than 10 times the amount offered by the Co-operative

Societies. He had further pointed out that Paragraph No.9 of the Hon'ble Division Bench to impress upon the Court that the Hon'ble Division Bench has held that the State largesse cannot be given to some one on a platter ignoring the financial implications. He had further contended that the Hon'ble Division Bench has confirmed the order dated 31.08.2020 passed by the learned Single Judge in WP(MD).No.5485 of 2020 in which the learned Single Judge has directed the authorities to conduct public auction of fishery rights of a Tank and thereafter directed the fishermen Co-operative Society to match the highest bid. Hence, he contended that the present writ petitions are not maintainable and they are liable to be dismissed.

6.I have considered the submissions made on either side and perused the Government orders and Judgements produced on either side.

Discussion:

7.A perusal of the Revenue Standing Order No.211 clearly discloses that the disposal of the fishery rights by way of lease without auction is available to the Co-operative Societies of fishermen or Harijans engaged in fishing. In the order of preference, the Co-operative Societies of fishermen has been placed above all other two preferences. It could be further seen that only when the fishermen Co-operative Societies are not willing to take the lease, it should be given in favour of the Panchayat and if both of them are not willing to take it, then public auction has to be resorted to grant of lease

in favour of the private individuals. It can also be seen that the Panchayat or a Co-operative Societies cannot claim the lease as a matter of right. The said lease could be refused on adequate ground as reported by the Administrative authority namely the District Collector.

8.Let us consider G.O.(Ms).No.332, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries (FS-IV) Department dated 17.11.1993. As per paragraph No.3 of the said G.O, the Government has confirmed the validity of Revenue Standing Order No.211 and also held that the said Revenue Standing Order will continue to operate in future. As per the said G.O, public auction can be resorted to only if the Co-operative Societies of fishermen or Harijans engaged in fishing or Panchayat are not willing to take up the lease. As per Clause-(xi), the Collector of the concerned District shall continue to be the lessor in respect of the Tanks under his control. A perusal of the Clause-6 indicates that the Government order has been issued with the concurrence of the Public Works Department.

9.A combined reading of RSO No.211 and G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993 will clearly point out that the State has taken a policy decision to confer some preferential rights in favour of the fishermen Co-operative Societies or Harijans engaged in fishing at the time of leasing out of fishery rights in a Tank which are vested with the Public Works Department.

10.The present writ petitions have been filed challenging G.O.Ms.No. 16, Public Works (W2) Department, dated 14.01.2011. Clause 4 (iv) of the said G.O, is particularly challenged by the writ petitioners. A perusal of the said Clause indicates that the Government has completely prohibited the individuals and associations from conducting public auction of fishery rights with regard to the Tanks under the control of Public Works Department without obtaining any prior permission from the Government.

11.A careful scrutiny of the above said Clause will clearly point out that it only prohibits the individuals and associations from conducting public auction without obtaining prior permission from the Government. There is no indication whatsoever that the preference granted in favour of the fishermen Co-operative Societies under Revenue Standing Order No.211 and G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993 have been taken away. In the impugned G.O, RSO No.211 or G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993 have not been specifically superseded or cancelled. Hence, the only conclusion that could be arrived at, is that the impugned G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011 prohibits the un-authorised public auction conducted by the individuals and associations without permission of the Government. As far as the case of fishermen Co-operative Societies are concerned, there is no allegation that they are conducting public auction. In fact, they are relying upon RSO.No. 211 and G.O.Ms.No.332 to contend that without conducting public auction,

lease should be granted in their favour on payment of upset price to be fixed by the concerned authority. Hence, viewed from any angle, G.O.Ms.16, dated 14.01.2011 cannot be said to be against with the fishermen Co-operative Societies.

12.The fishermen Co-operative Societies have also challenged G.O.Ms.No.72 dated 06.05.2014. This is only a consequential Government order opening a separate head of account for the purpose of remitting the amount that is collected through public auction. Hence, this Government Order in no way affects the rights of the fishermen Co-operative Societies. Hence, I do not agree with the submissions made by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners that G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011, the impugned Government Orders are in violation of RSO No.211 and G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993.

13.In all the three writ petitions, an order passed by the Executive Engineer of Kodayar Basin Irrigation, Public Works Department, dated 11.02.2015 has also been challenged. In the said order, the fourth respondent had communicated to the Revenue Divisional Officer and Tahsildhar to the effect that auctioning of fishing right is exclusively vested with Public Works Department in view of G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011. Hence, no allotment could be made in favour of the individuals or Societies. In fact, if any allotments have already been made, they should be cancelled and a report

may be submitted. According to the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners , G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011 only prohibits conducting of a public auction by the individuals and associations. It does not prohibit the allotment in favour of the Co-operative Fishermen Societies. Hence, the fourth respondent in the writ petition has misinterpreted G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2022 and has passed the impugned order on 11.02.2015.

14.A perusal of G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011 clearly indicates that what is prohibited under the said Government order is conduct of public auction by the individuals and Societies with regard to the Tank vested with the Public Works Department without obtaining permission from the Government. The said Government order no way prohibits allotment in favour of the Societies where the said allotment is made by the District Collector concerned. Hence, I am of the considered opinion that the order dated 11.02.2015 has misinterpreted G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011 and a communication has been issued, as if no allotment could be made in favour of the Co-operative Societies. Hence, the impugned order dated 11.02.2015 is without jurisdiction and the same is hereby set aside.

15.In W.P(MD).No.13026 of 2015, a public auction notice issued by the fifth respondent herein on 14.07.2015 is also under challenge. The said public auction notice is for the period between 01.07.2015 and 30.06.2016. The period for which auction was proposed, has already expired and the same

does not deserve to be considered at this length of time.

16.The legal submissions on the side of the writ petitioner challenging the impugned Government orders are not sustainable in view of the fact that there is no reference in the said Government orders with regard to the completely taking away of the preferential rights conferred upon the fishermen Co-operative Societies as contemplated under RSO.No.211 and G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993. Hence, the petitioners who are the fishermen Co-operative Societies cannot be considered to be an aggrieved person to challenge the said G.O, The preferential allotment of lease in favour of the petitioner Society has not been cancelled under the impugned Government order. Hence, I do not find that the petitioner Societies have made out any legal ground of violation of statutory or constitutional provisions to attack the Government orders impugned in the writ petitions.

17.The learned Senior Counsel had contended that the order passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P(MD).No.5485 of 2020 dated 31.08.2020 has been confirmed in W.A(MD).Nos.1251 and 923 of 2020 by an order dated 03.02.2021. This order of the Hon'ble Division Bench is only restricted to a particular Society and no ratio has been laid down in the said Judgement. He had further contended that the observations made by the Hon'ble Division Bench in Paragraph No.10 of the said Judgement that “it is better for the authority to follow this methodology in future in all the cases” is only a

passing reference. I am not in agreement with the said contention. In paragraph No.9, the Hon'ble Division Bench has held that in public interest, the fishing rights in a tank have to be leased out only in public auction. The Hon'ble Division Bench has also called upon the official respondents to re-do the exercise by keeping in view of the price augmented on the last occasion. They have further pointed out the State largesse cannot be given to some one on a platter ignoring the financial implications. The Hon'ble Bench has further pointed out that if public auction is not conducted, the Government would lose the revenue. Hence, it is clear that the observations made by the Hon'ble Division Bench in Paragraph No.10 that it is better for the authorities to follow public auction in all future cases cannot be considered to be a mere passing reference and it is the direction to the authorities to conduct public auction with regard to all tanks. In case, if the petitioners are aggrieved by the said observations or directions, it is for them to work out their remedy in a manner known to law.

18.The learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioners had further contended that the government should come out with a specific policy decision whether they are continuing with the preferential rights in favour of the fishermen Co-operative Societies or not in the light of RSO.No.211 and G.O.Ms.No.332 dated 17.11.1993. The learned Additional Advocate General by way of reply to the said submission has contended that the Government

in principle has accepted the Judgement of the Hon'ble Division Bench in WA(MD).Nos.1251 and 923 of 2020 dated 03.02.2021 and they are working out a methodology for placing a legal frame work on record to implement the order of the Hon'ble Division Bench. Therefore, it is clear that the Government is always at liberty to take a different decision at a different point of time considering the augmentation of income of the State which in turn will augment the income of the farmers' association.

19.The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners had contended that if the upset price is fixed by conducting a public auction, the private individuals will escalate the price and thereafter make the fishermen Co-operative Societies unable to pay the said escalated price. The fishermen Co-operative Societies would not be in a position to match the exorbitant/escalated price quoted by the private individuals. The learned Single Judge in W.P(MD).No.5485 dated 31.08.2020 has categorically directed the authorities to conduct public auction and directed the fishermen Co-operative Societies to match the highest bid. This order of the learned Single Judge was confirmed by the Hon'ble Division Bench in WA(MD).No. 1251 and 923 of 2020 dated 03.02.2021. Hence, this Court is not in a position to consider the said submission of the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner with regard to fixing of the upset price. The learned Single Judge of this Court in WP(MD).No.13591 and 15088 of 2021 dated 19/23

28.10.2021 after following the Hon'ble Division Bench Judgement, by way of concession has directed the authorities that the Co-operative Societies may not be directed to exactly match the highest price but they can be granted 10% concession. The grant of preferential rights in favour of the fishermen Co-operative Society, fixing up of upset price and grant of concession in matching the highest bid are all within the realm of the executive functioning of the Government. This Court could not, in exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India direct the Government to grant some preferential rights in favour of particular Society or grant concession with regard to fixing up of upset price or payment of highest price. It is for the Government to take a policy decision in the said matter in order to balance the financial rights of the State and the plight of the fishermen who are the members of the fishermen Society. Hence, this Court is not in a position to express any opinion on the above said issue.

20. Conclusion:

(a).In view of the above said discussion, the Government order impugned in the writ petitions are not ultra virus of any other statutory provision or provisions of Constitution of India. Hence, the prayer with regard to quashing of the said Government order is hereby rejected. The consequential order dated 11.02.2015 passed by the fourth respondent misinterpreting G.O.Ms.No.16 dated 14.01.2011 is hereby set aside. The

auction notice that is challenged in WP(MD).No.13026 of 2015 dated 14.07.2015 is hereby rejected on the ground that the tenure for which public auction was called for, has already expired.

(b).In view of the order passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench in WA(MD).Nos.1251 and 923 of 2020 dated 03.02.2021 directing to conduct public auction for leasing out the fishery rights and thereafter, calling upon the Co-operative Societies to match the highest bid, the mandamus sought for, to implement G.O.Ms.No.332, Animal Husbandry and Fisheries (FS-IV) Department dated 17/11/1993 is rejected.

(c). In view of the above said discussion, the writ petitions are allowed only to the extent of setting aside the order passed by the fourth respondent herein dated 11.02.2015. In all other respects, the writ petitions stand dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

20 .10.2022

Internet : Yes/No
Index : Yes/No
msa

To

1.The Principal Secretary to Government
State of Tamil Nadu
Public Works Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

2.The Secretary to Government
Animal Husbandry and Fisheries Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

3.The Secretary to Government
Revenue Department
Fort St.George
Chennai 600 009

4.The Executive Engineer
Public Works Department, Water Resources Organisation
Kodayar Basin Division
Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District

5.The Thasildar
Agasteeswaram Taluk
Nagercoil, Kanyakumari District

6.The Deputy Director of Fisheries (Regional)
Distillery Road, Vadaseri, Nagercoil
Kanyakumari District

7.The Assistant Engineer
Water Resources Organisation
Public Works Department
Pattanamkal Section
Kuzhithurai
Kanyakumari District

8.The Tashildar
Kalkulam Taluk
Thuckalay
Kanyakumari District

9.The Thasildar
Thovalai Taluk
Bhoothapandi
Kanyakumari District

W.P(MD).Nos.10489, 13026 and 13027 of 2015

R.VIJAYAKUMAR, J.

msa

Pre-delivery common order made in

W.P.(MD).Nos.10489, 13026 and 13027 of 2015
and

MP(MD).Nos.2 & 3 of 2015,
WMP(MD).Nos.2150 & 5411 of 2016 and MP(MD).Nos.1 to 3 of 2015,
WMP(MD).No.2145 of 2016 and MP(MD).Nos.1 & 2 of 2015 and
WMP(MD).No.2146 of 2016

20.10.2022