



WEB COPY



A.Nos. 2555 & 3937 of 2023

in

C.S.No. 374 of 2017

P.T.ASHA, J.

A compliance report has been filed into the Court and the same is taken on file. In the compliance report it is submitted that Kalaimani is now running the shop no.15, through his nephew (sister's son), one Vivek Anand. The compliance report is taken on file.

2. The two contempt applications have been filed on the premise that the shops belonging to the plaintiffs are now not being run by them and now the 5th defendant is taking steps to induct the other persons to run the shops and that the 5th defendant is blocking the passage by putting plastic and thermocol fish boxes in front of the plaintiffs' shops.



3. Today, the parties had appeared before this Court and adduced that each of them are in possession of the following shops:

Party	Shop
B.Ganapathi	Shop No.2
M.Mohammed Ali	Shop No.3
P.Ramadoss	Shop No.4
G.R.Apparaj	No.6 (Through his representative)
K.Basker	No.9
S.Harikrishnan (Deceased) Now run by his son.	No.10
M.C.Ravi (Through his son)	No.11
S.Anbarasan	No.12
K.R.Kalaimani	No.15
J.T.Jalal	No.18

4. Therefore, it is very clear that all the plaintiffs are running their shops either by themselves or through their representatives and the allegations of contempt are non-existent. As regards A.No.2555 of 2023, it is admitted by Ramadoss, the 4th plaintiff that the 5th defendant



is not running any shop in the market. Therefore, the question of the 5th defendant causing hindrance to the plaintiffs by storing the fish cases is not made out. Be that as it may, it is well open to the parties to re-stake plastic and thermocol fish boxes stored in front of the shops, which obstruct the passages.

5. In the light of the Court examining each of the plaintiffs, it is clearly evident that no contempt is made out. Therefore, the applications are dismissed with the above direction.

21.09.2023

kan



WEB COPY



P.T.ASHA, J.

kan

A.Nos. 2555 & 3937 of 2023

21.09.2023