



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 33555 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.11.2023

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.D. AUDIKESAVALU

W.P. No. 33555 of 2023

and

W.M.P. No. 33368 of 2023

M/s. Peri Institute of Technology,
Rep. by its Trustee, Shri.K.Periasamy,
Thirumalai Nagar,
Mannivakkam,
Chengalpattu District.

... Petitioner

-VS-

The President,
Mannivakkam Village Panchayat,
Mannivakkam,
Kattankulathur Union,
Chengalpattu District.

... Respondent

Prayer:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, call for the records of the respondent in Na.Ka.No. 76/2023 dated 10.11.2023 and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mrs. Hema Muralikrishnan

For Respondent : Mr. T.Chezhiyan



W.P. No. 33555 of 2023

WEB COPY

ORDER

Heard Mrs. Hema Muralikrishnan, Learned Counsel for the Petitioner and Mr. T.Chezhiyan, Learned Counsel for the Respondent and perused the materials placed on record, apart from the pleadings of the parties.

2. The Respondent, in the proceedings in Na. Ka. No. 76/2023 dated 10.11.2023, which is challenged in the Writ Petition, has called upon the Petitioner to produce the planning permission obtained by it for the construction made in Survey Nos.40, 41, 42/1, 2, 44, 48/2, 4, 5, 6, 49/1, 2A, 2B, 3, 50/2A, 2B, 4, 62/3, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68/1, 2, 69, 70, 75/1A2, 1A3, 75/2B and 83/2 in Manivakkam Village, Kattankulathur, Chengalpattu District, which is in the nature of show cause notice for which it can submit its explanation.

3. On a perusal of the impugned proceedings, it is seen that the Petitioner has been called upon to produce the planning permission obtained by it for the construction made in Survey Nos. 40, 41, 42/1, 2, 44, 48/2, 4, 5, 6, 49/1, 2A, 2B, 3, 50/2A, 2B, 4, 62/3, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68/1, 2, 69, 70, 75/1A2, 1A3, 75/2B and 83/2 in Manivakkam Village, Kattankulathur, Chengalpattu District.



W.P. No. 33555 of 2023

WEB COPY

4. The consistent legal position has been reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Union of India -vs- Kunisetty Satyanarayana*** [(2006) 12 SCC 28] that a charge memo or show cause notice cannot be challenged before the completion of enquiry and the proceedings cannot be interdicted till it reaches its logical conclusion. It would be useful here to extract the relevant passages from the said decision which read as follows:-

*“13. It is well settled by a series of decisions of this Court that ordinarily no writ lies against a charge sheet or show-cause notice vide **Executive Engineer, Bihar State Housing Board -vs- Ramdesh Kumar Singh** [JT 1995 (8) SC 331], **Special Director -vs- Mohd. Ghulam Ghouse** (AIR 2004 SC 1467), **Ulagappa -vs- Divisional Commissioner, Mysore** [2001(10) SCC 639], **State of U.P. -vs- Brahm Datt Sharma** (AIR 1987 SC 943) etc.*

14. The reason why ordinarily a writ petition should not be entertained against a mere show-cause notice or charge-sheet is that at that stage the writ petition may be held to be premature. A mere charge-sheet or show-cause notice does not give rise to any cause of action, because it does not amount to an adverse order which affects the rights of any party unless the same has been



W.P. No. 33555 of 2023

WEB COPY

issued by a person having no jurisdiction to do so. It is quite possible that after considering the reply to the show-cause notice or after holding an enquiry the authority concerned may drop the proceedings and/or hold that the charges are not established. It is well settled that a writ lies when some right of any party is infringed. A mere show-cause notice or charge-sheet does not infringe the right of any one. It is only when a final order imposing some punishment or otherwise adversely affecting a party is passed, that the said party can be said to have any grievance.

15. Writ jurisdiction is discretionary jurisdiction and hence such discretion under Article 226 should not ordinarily be exercised by quashing a show-cause notice or charge sheet.

16. No doubt, in some very rare and exceptional cases the High Court can quash a charge-sheet or show-cause notice if it is found to be wholly without jurisdiction or for some other reason if it is wholly illegal. However, ordinarily the High Court should not interfere in such a matter.”

Having due regard to the aforesaid legal position, as there is nothing which precludes the Petitioner from raising the contentions in the Writ Petition in the



W.P. No. 33555 of 2023

reply to be submitted to the Respondent, who is bound to deal with the same before coming to any ultimate conclusion, there is no necessity for the Court to interfere at this pre-mature stage of this matter.

5. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner raises a plea that the impugned notice is the outcome of strained relationship between the parties arising out of the disputes relating to property tax for the same property. However, it would not be possible to interfere with the impugned notice on that ground, when the Petitioner has a legal obligation to obtain planning permission for construction of any building in its property. In such circumstances, the Court is inclined to pass the following order:-

- (i) it shall be incumbent upon the Petitioner to submit its explanation to the show cause notice, which is impugned in the Writ Petition, if not done already, to the concerned authority within 15 days from the date of receipt of copy of this order;
- (ii) in the event of not being satisfied with the explanation submitted by the Petitioner, enquiry shall be conducted following the prescribed procedure after affording full opportunity of personal hearing to the Petitioner to explain his position in that regard and reasoned orders shall be passed dealing with each of the contentions raised on merits and in accordance



W.P. No. 33555 of 2023

with law and the decision taken communicated under written acknowledgment;

- (iii) if any adverse decision is taken, the Petitioner may pursue legal remedies in accordance with law; and
- (iv) if the Petitioner does not make any representation in that regard, the Respondent is at liberty to proceed in accordance with law.
- (v) though obvious, it is made clear that no view has been expressed by the Court on the merits of the controversy involved in the matter.

In fine, this Writ Petition is disposed on the aforesaid terms. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed. No costs.

29.11.2023

Index: Yes/No
NCC: Yes/No

Note: Issue order copy by 23.02.2024.

ns1

To

The President,
Mannivakkam Village Panchayat,
Mannivakkam,
Kattankulathur Union,
Chengalpattu District.



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 33555 of 2023

P.D. AUDIKESAVALU, J.

nsi

W.P. No. 33555 of 2023

29.11.2023