



W.P.No.900 of 2018

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.03.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P.No.900 of 2018

and W.M.P.Nos.1081 & 1082 of 2018

S.Karthikeyan

. . . Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Managing Director,
Arasu Cable TV Corporation Ltd.,
34/123, 6th Floor,
Dukar Tower,
Marsals Road,
Chennai-600 008.

2. The Special Tahsildar,
Tamil Nadu Cable TV Corporation Ltd.,
Krishnagiri District.

3. A.V.R.Nehru

. . . Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ, Order or Direction in the nature of Writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to the impugned order in Proceeding No.B6/10726/2017 dated 04.12.2017 issued by the 1st Respondent to the 3rd respondent and



W.P.No.900 of 2018

quash the same and pursuant to the same take action as per the communication of the 2nd respondent in Letter.No.Na.Ka.167/2017 (TACTV) dated 14.12.2017.

For petitioner : M/s.B.Prasanna Vinoth

For Respondents : No Appearance

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed challenging the impugned proceedings dated 04.12.2017 which was issued by the 1st respondent to the 3rd respondent and for a direction to the 1st respondent to take necessary action as per the communication of the 2nd respondent dated 14.12.2017.

2. The petitioner is a cable TV operator. It is the case of the petitioner that he was appointed as a digital service provider by the 1st respondent for providing signal to the local cable TV operators of the Krishnagiri District for a period of one year vide order dated 23.10.2017. However, vide the impugned order dated 04.12.2017, the 3rd respondent has been appointed as a cable TV operator in detriment to the petitioner when already the petitioner is functioning in the locality. Challenging the same,



W.P.No.900 of 2018

this Writ Petition has been filed.

WEB COPY

3. This Court heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

4. Even a cursory perusal of the appointment order of the petitioner as a cable TV operator reveals that he was granted the contract only for a period of one year. Such being the case, the petitioner as a matter of right cannot demand that no other person should be appointed as a cable TV operator in the said locality. Even in the impugned order, it clearly shows that service providers could be appointed in the locality for providing the cable TV signal to the public. That being the case, the appointment of the 3rd respondent also as a service provider to receive the signal and transmit the same cannot be said to be impermissible. The petitioner, as a matter of right cannot claim that he alone should be appointed as the service provider in the locality. The petitioner with open eyes has entered into a contract for a period of one year, the petitioner cannot come before this Court and claim that no other person can be appointed in addition to the petitioner. It is within the domain of the official respondents to decide the number of persons to be appointed as service providers.



W.P.No.900 of 2018

WEB COPY

5. Further, the contract is for a period of one year for which appointment order was issued in the year 2017. By now, the period of one year has lapsed and therefore, nothing survives for consideration at this point of time for further adjudication.

6. In view of the above, this Writ Petition stands closed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

15.03.2023

NHS

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No



WEB COPY



W.P.No.900 of 2018

To

1. The Managing Director,
Arasu Cable TV Corporation Ltd.,
34/123, 6th Floor,
Dukar Tower,
Marsals Road,
Chennai-600 008.
2. The Special Tahsildar,
Tamil Nadu Cable TV Corporation Ltd.,
Krishnagiri District.



WEB COPY



W.P.No.900 of 2018

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

NHS

W.P.No.900 of 2018

15.03.2023