



WEB COPY



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27..04..2023

CORAM

**The Honourable MS.JUSTICE V.M.VELUMANI
AND
The Honourable MR. JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN**

**Writ Appeal No.4334 of 2019
&
C.M.P.No.27814 of 2019**

The Commissioner,
Hosur Municipality,
Municipal Office,
Hosur, Krishnagiri District.

..... Appellant

-Versus-

1.N.Ramesh

2.The Hosur Municipality,
Rep. By its Chairman,
Municipal Office,
Hosur, Krishnagiri District.

3.The Commissioner of Municipal Administration,
Ezhilagam,
Chennai.

4.The Chairman and Managing Director,
TASMAC, Chennai

[Respondents 3 & 4 were suo motu impleaded as per order
dated 18.09.2015 made in W.P.No.29357 of 2015]



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

5.The District Collector,
Krishnagiri.

WEB COPY

[5th Respondent was impleaded as per order dated 27.10.2015
made in W.P.No.29357 of 2015]

6.K.M.Sukumar

..... Respondents

Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent, praying to set aside
the order dated 24.10.2019 made in W.P.No.29357 of 2015.

Appellant : *Mr.N.Subbarayalu*

Respondents : *Mr.T.M.Hariharan for R1*

Mr.R.Vigneswaran,
Government Advocate for RR3 & 5

Mr.L.Chandrakumar
[No Appearance] for R6
No Appearance for RR2 & 4



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

JUGDEMENT

WEB COPY

[JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT WAS MADE BY
V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN.J.,]

This Writ Appeal raises two interesting questions. The first question being whether the executive arm of a municipality can refuse to implement validly passed resolutions by a municipal council? The other question being whether the executive arm can obstruct the formation of a street / lane, when the power to form the same is with the municipal council?

2. The writ petitioner approached this court in W.P.No.29357 of 2015. He had sought for the relief of a writ of mandamus to direct the respondents to restore the Southern Entrance to Hosur Bus Stand from Vannar Street, which entry point had been illegally closed by the respondents and for consequential order.

3. It is the case of the writ petitioner that the public of Hosur were having access to Hosur Bus Stand from Vannar Street through a passage in S.No.176. The appellant had in and about 1986 constructed a row of shops on the southern



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

side of the bus stand. The grievance is that Shop Nos.32 & 33 blocked the access of the public from Vannar Street. The petitioner had further pleaded that the access from the northern side is highly congested one as it is National Highway and the public were happy to have access to the bus stand through the southern side.

4. The issue was placed before the Municipal Council. The Municipal Council passed three resolutions, first one was on 30.04.1997 in Resolution No.198; the second one was on 31.03.1999 in Resolution No.174; and the third one was on 11.02.2022 in Resolution No.183. As per the resolution of the year 1997, the Municipality had resolved to restore the passage. The Municipal Council had directed the Commissioner, Hosur Municipality, to remove the Shop Nos.32 & 33 and to restore the entrance to the bus stand from the southern end. The Commissioner of Municipal Administration, Chennai, who is the 3rd respondent to the writ appeal, had directed the Hosur Municipality to conduct a field inspection and to obtain a permission from the Director of Town and Country Planning. On 05.04.1999, the Director of Town and Country Planning, addressed the Hosur Municipality suggesting that western street which is about



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

50 feet from the bus stand may be extended. He also suggested that the views of the Commissioner of Municipality Administration may be taken. Subsequently, the Director of Town and Country Planning, after the perusal of the District Municipalities Act, 1920, came to a conclusion that creation of a new street is within the jurisdiction of the Municipality and therefore, he had left the decision to them.

5. On 12.10.1998, the passage in S.No.176 which is the subject matter of the writ petition, bearing old S.No.6/1A1A1A4, was gifted to Hosur Municipality for the purpose of creating access. Taking note of these developments, by a resolution dated 11.02.2002, the Municipal Council directed restoration of the southern entrance for access. It is on record that when the new bus stand was created, the existing municipal passage was closed. Since the Commissioner of Municipality did not implement the several resolutions of the Municipal Council, W.P.No.29357 of 2015 came to be filed. In that writ petition, this court was pleased to appoint an Advocate Commissioner to suggest, whether it would be beneficial to restore the Municipal Passage on the south of the bus stand.



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

6. Nearly after a year, on 12.04.2018, the Advocate Commissioner, who was appointed by this court, submitted a report categorically stating that if Shop Nos.32 & 33 are removed and a passage is created, it would be beneficial to the public of Hosur. After detailed arguments were heard, a learned single Judge of this court passed an order on 24.10.2019. The finding of the learned single Judge are extracted as under:-

“9. Considering the report dated 12.04.2018 filed by the learned Advocate Commissioner stating that there is no passage in existence from Vannar Street to Bus Stand and also considering Resolution No.183, dated 11.02.2002, passed by the Hosur Municipal Council deciding to form a passage on the Southern side of the Bus Stand and also considering the Gift Deed dated 12.10.1998 donating 880 sq.ft. in favour of the second respondent for the said purpose, this Court posed a question to Mr.N.Subbarayalu, learned counsel for the Hosur Municipality, as to what prevented them to provide access to the Bus Stand from Southern Side, although initially he has heavily opposed the prayer made by the petitioner, by referring to Section 35 of the Act, he has submitted that Section 35 of the Act gives enormous power to the District Collector to enforce execution of Resolution, therefore, a direction may be given to the District Collector to send a report on the Resolution with explanation, if any, to the State Government, forwarding a copy of the same to the learned counsel for the petitioner. If the State Government comes forward



WEB COPY



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

on the said report, the first respondent will act accordingly thereon.

10. But, the report of the Advocate Commissioner clearly shows that there is no passage existing from Vannar street to reach the Bus Stand by public, hence, it is to be noted that the first respondent, after deciding to construct new Bus Stand with better facilities to accommodate the increasing traffic, had also demolished the old Bus Stand and constructed the new Bus Stand during the years 2007-2008. During the construction of work, although the second respondent, as pleaded in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition, had closed the Southern Entrance with an assurance that they would restore back the entrance of Southern Side, ironically, it could be seen that the second respondent has not come forward to restore the same, more particularly, even after Resolution No.183, dated 11.02.2002, passed by the Hosur Municipal Council, unanimously deciding to provide access to the Bus Stand from the Southern Side. Moreover, one T.M.Rangasami and two others, namely, T.N.Sathish and T.N.Suresh Babu, have also executed a Gift Deed dated 12.10.1998 through the Power of Attorney/sixth respondent herein, in favour of the second respondent, donating 880 sq.ft. of land for the formation of passage to Bus Stand from Southern Side. Therefore, objections raised by the learned counsel appearing for the Hosur Municipality do not carry any merit in view of the Resolution dated 11.02.2002 passed by the Hosur Municipal Council coupled with the above said Gift Deed executed in favour of the second respondent for the formation of passage to Bus Stand from Southern Side.



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

11. Hence, in such view of the matter, this Court, taking note of the fact that the second respondent had already passed Resolution No.183, dated 11.02.2002, for the formation of passage on the Southern Side of the Bus Stand from Vannar Street, and also taking note of the report dated 12.04.2018 filed by the learned Advocate Commissioner stating that there is no passage existing to reach the Bus Stand from Southern side of Vannar Street, hereby directs the second respondent to act on the basis of the said Resolution dated 11.02.2002 passed by the Hosur Municipal Council for the formation of passage on the Southern side of the Bus Stand from Vannar Street, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”

7. The learned single Judge took note of the resolutions passed by the Municipal Council and had come to a conclusion that the passage be formed by the appellant on the southern side of the bus stand from Vannar Street within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order. Aggrieved by such directions, the present Writ Appeal has been filed.

8. We heard Mr.N.Subbarayalu, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr.T.M.Hariharan, learned counsel, who appeared for the contesting 1st respondent.



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

WEB COPY

9. The learned counsel for the appellant would argue that the public have no right to have access to the bus stand from the south side on the Vannar Street. He would argue that it is true under Section 22 of the District Municipalities Act, it is the duty of the Executive Authority, i.e., the appellant herein to implement the resolutions of the Municipal Council. He would argue that, in this case, the Executive Authority is not willing to implement the same and, therefore, the solution to the imbroglio is only to appeal to the good sense of the District Collector under Section 35 of the District Municipalities Act. He would rely upon a few judgments of this court to state that when a person does not have a right, a writ petition is not maintainable. He would state that the Commissioner, Hosur Municipality, is not willing to implement the resolutions, though it has been reiterated thrice by the Municipal Council because it would amount to a loss of Rs.5000/- per year to the Municipality.

10. The learned counsel for the appellant would first refer to the judgment in **State of Orissa v. Ram Chandra Dev** reported in **AIR 1964 SC 685** to submit that a person who has no right, is not entitled to invoke under Article 226



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

of the Constitution. He would then refer to the judgment of this court in **Retired Official Association v. Sports Development Authority of Tamil Nadu** reported in (2005) 3 M.L.J. 556. Basing his argument on this judgment, he would state that it is always open to the Government to change or abandon any plan and no writ petition can be filed for enforcing the resolution. He would then cite a judgment of this court in **Shantha Srinivasan v. The Secretary to Government, Housing and Urban Development Department, Fort St. George, Chenani** reported in 2015 (2) CWC 366 to state that a resolution is not an order and, therefore, a writ petition cannot be filed challenging the same. To the same effect, he would rely upon a judgment of this Court in W.P.(MD) No.323 of 2015 & batch cases dated 23.08.2017 - **The Trustee of Diocese of Thuckalay, rep. By its Correspondent v. Dr.C.Radhakrishnan Nair and others.**

11. Inviting the attention of this court to a judgment of the Supreme Court in Commissioner of **Income Tax v. Hindustan Bulk Carriers** reported in (2003) 3 SCC 57, more particularly, para 21, Mr.N.Subbarayalu, would state that the court will have to reject an attempt to construct a statute that would defeat the



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

plain intention of the legislation and that one section of the statute should not be used to defeat another provision. He would also refer to **M.Mokkaiyan, President Vaigai Dam Fishermen Cooperative Society v. The Assistant Director, Fisheries Department, Madurai** reported in (1999) 2 MLJ 80 to state that where a power is given to do a certain thing in a certain way, the thing must be done in that way or not at all and that other methods of performance are necessarily forbidden. He would state that Section 35 of the District Municipalities Act is a bar for filing a writ petition as it is only the District Collector, who can take action for the failure of the Commissioner of a Municipality to implement a resolution of the Municipal Council and this court ought not to have issued a writ of mandamus.

12. Rebutting this argument, Mr.T.M.Hariharan would state as per the original records, in particular, the Town Survey Land Register, the land in S.No.176 has been shown to be poramboke land, i.e., belonging to the Government. He would further submit that the Municipality has power to open a street and would refer to Section 163(1) (a) of the District Municipalities Act, 1920. He would then argue that the power to order closure of a street is available



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

only with the State Government under Section **163(1)(c)** of the District Municipalities Act and that since the Government has not canceled the resolutions passed by the Municipal Council, the Commissioner of Municipality is bound to implement it under Section 22 of the District Municipalities Act, 1920. He would state that the report of the Advocate Commissioner appointed by this court has given a clear and categorical finding that opening of the passage would be beneficial to the public at large in Hosur and for reasons best known to the appellant, he is refusing to implement the same.

13. We have carefully considered the arguments advanced on either side.

14. It is on record that three resolutions were passed by the Municipal Council of Hosur Municipality. By resolution No.198 dated 30.04.1997, a member of the municipal council had laid out a proposal that a passage be formed to connect the existing passage to the bus stand and had suggested that Shop Nos.32 & 33 should be demolished. The Municipal Council accepted this resolution. While passing the said resolution, the Municipal Council took note of the fact that the owner of the private land was willing to execute a gift deed in



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

favour of the Municipality. Accordingly, a registered gift deed was also executed and registered in favour of the Municipality on 12.10.1998. This shows that the written consent given by the owner fructified into a registered gift deed and the passage which was sought for by the Municipal Council was also transferred in its favour. On this issue, the advice from the Commissioner of Municipal Administration was sought for. The Commissioner had also informed that a road situated beyond 50 feet on the west could be extended and a link can be made to the new bus stand.

15. This view about linking of the new bus stand, by formation of a new road, was also placed before the Municipal Council. The Municipal Council took note of the fact that the passage had been gifted by the owner to the Municipality and that if the suggestion of the Commissioner of Municipal Administration were to be accepted, it would require acquisition of land and as the financial position of the Municipality was not in good condition, they resolved to form the road by removing the Shop Nos.32 & 33.



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

16. When this view was sent to the Commissioner of Municipal Administration, he had responded positively and had stated that the formation of the road was within the powers of the Municipal Council and therefore, left it to their wisdom. The same was the response from the Additional Secretary to the Government of Tamil Nadu.

17. The public of Hosur had, yet again, petitioned their elected representatives at the Municipal Council to form the road. The Municipal Council, as is required, had sought for the opinion of the Commissioner of Municipality. The Commissioner, Hosur Municipality, had responded that by demolition of Shop Nos.32 & 33, the Municipality would lose about Rs.5000/- per year and that there is a possibility of increase in value of the property abutting the passage and, therefore, had advised against the proposal for demolition of the shops. Taking into consideration of these things, the Municipal Council passed the final resolution on 11.02.2002. The said resolution reads as follows:-



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

“தீர்மானம் எண் 183

WEB COPY

புதிய பேருந்து நிலையத்தில் ஏற்கனவே உள்ள பாதைகள் பழைய பெங்குளர் சாலையை மட்டுமே இணைப்பதால், ஜனப்பர் பேட்டை, நாமால் பேட்டை, நஞ்சுண்டேஸ்வரர் கோவில் தெரு மற்றும் போஸ் பஜார் ஆகிய இடங்களுக்கு செல்ல நீண்ட தூரம் ஆகிறது என்பதாலும் கடந்த 5 ஆண்டு காலமாக அந்தப் பகுதி மக்களின் கோரிக்கையாகவும் உள்ளது என்பதாலும் ஏற்கனவே உள்ள பாதைகள் அதிக கூட்ட நெரிசலாகவும், மக்கள் சமூக விரோத செயல்களினால் மிகவும் அவதிப்படுவதாலும், காவல் துறையின் அறிவுறுத்தலின் பேரிலும் மன்றம் இந்த முடிவை அனைத்து உறுப்பினர்களும் ஏகமனதாக ஏற்றுக் கொண்டுள்ளதாலும் இந்த இணைப்பு சாலையை நகராட்சி நிர்வாக மண்டல இயக்குநர் அவர்களின் அனுமதி பெற்று அமைக்க தீர்மானிக்கப்பட்டது.

(ஓம்) பி.எம்.நஞ்சுண்டசாமி
நகர்மன்ற தலைவர்
ஒதுர் நகராட்சி,”

18. It is here the power of the Municipality to form a road becomes relevant. The District Municipalities Act, 1920 has given the power for formation of a road or a street to the Municipal Council itself. This is found under Section 163 which reads as follows:-

“163. Powers of municipal authorities.- (1) The council may -

- (a) lay out and make new public streets;
- (b) construct bridges and sub-ways;
- (c) turn, divert or with the special sanction of the



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

State Government permanently close any public street or part thereof;

(d) widen, open, extend or otherwise improve any public street;

.....”

[Emphasis supplied]

19. The Act itself states that compensation should be paid to the owners who would be affected by the formation of the road. Fortunately, in the case on hand, the owner of the land in S.No.179 has executed a gift deed in favour of the Municipality on 12.10.1998. Therefore, the issue of payment of compensation does not arise here. The Municipal Council, in its wisdom, had decided that it would create a street for the benefit of the public and was willing to absorb the loss of Rs.5000/- per year. The attitude of the Commissioner, who under Section 22 of the District Municipalities Act, is bound to implement the resolution of the Municipal Council is bewildering. Section 22 is clear and categorical and it reads as follows:-

“22. Executive authority to carry out council's resolutions. - The executive authority shall be bound to give effect to every resolution of the council unless such resolution is modified, suspended or canceled by a



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

controlling authority.”

WEB COPY

The words “**shall be bound to give effect to every resolution**” shows that the Executive Authority cannot take a different view from that of the Municipal Council. This is very clear to read, as the decision, is that of the elected representatives who are alive to the larger public interest than the Executive authority who is a member of a bureaucracy. The protection against any arbitrary decision is found under Section 36 of the District Municipalities Act, 1920. The Government is the controlling authority and if any resolution is passed, which in the opinion of the Government is contrary to law, or in excess of the powers of the Council or would result in danger to the human health and safety or to lead to riot or affray, the Government can step in and cancel / suspend or modify the resolution.

20. As per Section 22, if a resolution of the council is not interfered with by the controlling authority – the State Government, the Executive authority does not have any discretion, other than to implement the same. We find it surprising that three resolutions have been passed by the Municipal Council in 1997, 1999



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

and 2002 and the Commissioner of Hosur Municipality refuses to implement the same. It is here, we have to take note of the fact that under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, this court has the power to direct the executive authority to comply with the statutory provisions. The statute is clear and unambiguous. It states that the Executive Authority shall give effect to the resolution and when a resolution has been passed and reiterated twice, the Executive Authority cannot refuse to implement the same. If the resolution is not implemented as contemplated under Section 22, it would lead to arbitrariness and would put the hierarchy of Municipal Administration contemplated under The Tamil Nadu District Municipalities Act, 1920 into disarray.

21. We are not convinced with the argument that they did not have right to approach the court by way of mandamus. In the Hohfeld's Cube of Jurisprudential rights and duties, every right has a corresponding duty and vice versa. As per Section 22 of the District Municipalities Act, 1920, a duty is imposed on the appellant to implement the resolution of the municipal council. In case, the said duty is not discharged, a corresponding right is created on the members of the municipality. Section 35, by very nature, is only an



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

administrative corrective mechanism and does not interfere with the rights of the parties.

22. The arguments of the learned counsel for the Appellant that it is only the District Collector who has power to enforce the execution of the resolution does not appeal to us. Section 35 of the District Municipalities Act speaks about the power vested in the Collector to forward a reply to the Government, after receiving a reply from the Executive authority, for failure to implement the resolution. This is more in the nature of an administrative supervision. This section certainly does not empower the Commissioner of a Municipality to violate the law under Section 22 of the District Municipalities Act, 1920. Article 14 of the Constitution of India not only grants equality before law, but, further demands that there shall be equal protection of law. Section 22 of the District Municipalities Act, as we have already found, is clear and is mandatory. Failure to implement a resolution in terms of Section 22, violates the provision of law and therefore, it is arbitrary. An act which is arbitrary has to be struck down *proprio vigore* by Article 14.



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

23. When in exercise of its statutory powers, the Municipal Council has decided to form a road under Section 163(1)(a), it is not open to the Commissioner of the Municipality to keep the road closed. It is clear from the provision in Section 163(1)(c) of the District Municipalities Act, 1920 that the power to close such road is not given to the Commissioner of a Municipality but, it is given to the Municipal Council after obtaining special sanction from the State Government under Section 163(1)(c) of the District Municipalities Act. If a road has to be kept closed, then the power is given only to the Municipal Council - Elected Representatives and this statutory power cannot be usurped by the executive arm namely, the appellant herein.

24. The judgments cited by the learned counsel for the appellant in **M.Mokkaiyan, President Vaigai Dam Fishermen Cooperative Society v. The Assistant Director, Fisheries Department, Madurai (1999) 2 MLJ 80**, in fact goes against the appellant and it does not favour him. For the simple reason, if the road which has been laid out and gifted to the municipality has to be kept closed, that power can be exercised only by the municipal council and not by the Commissioner of a Municipality.



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

WEB COPY

25. The argument of the learned counsel for the appellant that the gifted passage has not been accepted by the municipality is of no avail. The factum of the gift as well as the mutation of the revenue records reflecting such gift is not in dispute before us. Therefore, once the land is gifted for the purpose of formation of a road and the same has been accepted by the Government, it is too much on the part of a small cog in the governance viz., the Commissioner of the Municipality to argue that he has not accepted the same. The Town Survey Land Register maintained by the Government of Tamil Nadu shows the transfer of land in S.NO.176, old S.No.6/1A1A1A4 from that of a private holding to a Government holding – poramboke. This shows that the road had been gifted and accepted by the Government and the revenue records also were accordingly mutated.

26. These findings should settle the issue for the writ petitioners. However, we want to point out that the writ court took the efforts of appointing the Advocate Commissioner and formulated 9 questions. One of the questions was, whether public would have to walk a long distance through the municipal



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

pathway to reach the bus stand and if the road is formed, as visualized by the council whether it would be beneficial to the public at large to have access through Vannar street. The findings to both these two questions are that, in order to reach the bus stand a person would have to walk nearly about 500 feet whereas if the lane is created as contemplated by the municipal council, the distance would be much shorter and that it would be beneficial to the public. We are able to perceive that it is this public interest that swayed the municipal council to form the road. We are unable to comprehend how an act taken in public interest can be controverted by the executive arm of the municipality.

27. We are not able to agree to the contention of the learned counsel for the appellant that Section 35 of the District Municipalities Act is a bar to an order under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Section 35 contemplates an order of administrative superior to see that the resolutions of the council are enforced. This is not a bar or even an alternative remedy for us to exercise our discretion to refuse issuance of a writ. The judgment cited by the learned counsel for the appellant do not apply to this case.



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

WEB COPY

28. Insofar as the judgment in **State of Orissa v. Ram Chandra Dev** reported in **AIR 1964 SC 685** is concerned, it was the case where the petitioners before the High Court had no interest over the property and had sought for a writ of mandamus not to be dispossessed. The Supreme Court had recorded in para 4 that the lands were held by the writ petitioners therein as service tenure and once the grant was resumed, the petitioners were not entitled to continue in possession.

29. We are not able to understand as to how that fact applies to the present case where the municipal council, in the interest of public, has created a road and it was sought to be obstructed by executive arm.

30. The second judgment relied on by the learned counsel for the appellant reported in **Retired Official Association v. Sports Development Authority of Tamil Nadu**, [(2005) 3 M.L.J. 556] is also not applicable to the present case. That was a case where the resolution had been passed to construct a Sports Stadium. Subsequently, the Government decided to cancel that resolution and directed the Sports Development Authority to construct a students hostel. The



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

writ petitioner sought for a direction that the students hostel must not be constructed and the original resolution passed by the State Government to construct a stadium should be enforced. The court held that it is the discretion of the Government how to put its land to use and if the Government finds better public purpose would be served by constructing a students hostel, the court should not interfere with the same.

31. In this case, the resolution has been passed by the statutory authority viz., the municipal council in exercise of its power under Section 163(1)(a) of the District Municipalities Act, 1920 to form a road. The only authority which can suspend or cancel a resolution is the State Government under Section 36 of the District Municipalities Act, 1920. When the said resolution has not been modified, suspended or canceled under Section 22, the Executive Authority must implement the resolution. We enquired with the learned counsel for the appellant if the resolution has been canceled and he answered in the negative. When such is the position, the judgment referred to above is totally inapplicable.

32. The next two orders referred to by the writ petitioners viz., **Shantha**



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

Srinivasan [2005 (2) CWC 366] and W.P.(MD) No.323 of 2015 & batch cases

dated 23.08.2017 - The Trustee of Diocese of Thuckalay, rep. By its Correspondent v. Dr.C.Radhakrishnan Nair and others are the cases where the resolutions that had been passed had been challenged by way of writ petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. It was in that light, the court held that passage of a mere declaration reclassifying the land does not attain finality till it is implemented by the competent authority. In the case on hand, the competent authority to form new road is Municipal Council. This is under Section 163(1)(a) of the District Municipalities Act. Therefore, the said judgments are not applicable to the present case.

33. The judgment of the learned single judge extracted above shows that he has taken into consideration all the resolutions passed by the municipal council, the report of the Advocate Commissioner as well as the larger public interest involved. The above narration would show that the benefit to the general public is much more and the statutory authority, the municipal council itself has decided to absorb the loss of Rs.5000/- per year as against the creation of an access to the general public. When the statutory authority as well as the learned single judge



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

have acted in the interest of general public, we are not in a position to appreciate the action of the appellant in taking all kinds of steps to obstruct the same.

34. In the light of the above discussions, we do not find any merit in the writ appeal and the same is dismissed. Had it been an appeal at the instance of a private party, we would have imposed costs on the appellant for obstructing a public welfare measure. Taking into consideration the status of the appellant, we are not inclined to impose any costs on him.

In the result, this Writ Appeal is dismissed and the order dated 24.10.2019 made in W.P.No.29357 of 2015 is confirmed. No costs. Consequently, connected CMP is closed.

(V.M.V.,J.) (V.L.N.,J.)
27..04..2023

Index : yes / no
Neutral Citation : yes / no
kmk



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

To

- 1.The Commissioner,
Hosur Municipality,
Municipal Office,
Hosur, Krishnagiri District.
- 2.The Chairman, Hosur Municipality,
Municipal Office,
Hosur, Krishnagiri District.
- 3.The Commissioner of Municipal Administration,
Ezhilagam, Chennai.
- 4.The Chairman and Managing Director,
TASMAC, Chennai
- 5.The District Collector, Krishnagiri.



WEB COPY



W.A.No.4334 of 2019 6

V.M.VELUMANI.J.,
AND
V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN.J.,
kmk

Writ Appeal No.4334 of 2019

27..04..2023