



W.P.(MD) No.3563 of 2023

WEB COPY BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : 22.02.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE D.KRISHNAKUMAR

AND

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI

W.P.(MD)No.3563 of 2023

S.Kalidoss

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1.The District Collector,

Ramanathapuram District,

Ramanathapuram.

2.The Special Tahsildar,

Adi Dravidar Welfare Office,

Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to extend a moratorium and refrain themselves from restoring the allotted free house pattas plot comprised in S.No.61/2 & 61/6 situated at Venthoni Group, Paramakudi Taluk,

Page 1 of 9



W.P.(MD) No.3563 of 2023

Ramanathapuram District in pursuance of the 2nd respondent through his proceedings including vide Na.Ka.A/52/2001, dated 24.03.2001, Na.Ka.A/52/2001, Na.Ka.A/52/2001, dated 19.04.2001, Na.Ka.A/52/2001, dated 14.06.2016, Na.Ka.A/52/2001, dated 11.06.2016 for any other alternative purpose, till the beneficiaries construct a houses on it on the basis of the petitioner's representation dated 01.10.2018 and 04.07.2022.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Indrachithu

For Respondents : Mr.M.Sarangan,
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by D.KRISHNAKUMAR, J.]

By consent of both parties, this Writ Petition is taken up for final disposal at the stage of admission itself.

2.According to the petitioner, the respondents made an attempt to cancel the free house site pattas allotted in favour of 59 persons in S.Nos.61/2 & 61/6 situated at Venthoni Group, Paramakudi Taluk, Ramanathapuram District on the ground that as per the conditions, the beneficiaries have not constructed



W.P.(MD) No.3563 of 2023

WEB COPY

houses in the land allotted to them. Therefore, the petitioner made representations to the respondents dated 01.10.2018 and 04.07.2022, seeking extension of time till the beneficiaries construct houses in the land allotted to them. Since the same have not been considered till date, the petitioner is before this Court with the aforesaid prayer.

3.Mr.M.Sarangan, learned Additional Government Pleader, who took notice on behalf of the respondents, vehemently contended that the petitioner has not placed any substantial material before this Court in support of his allegations and further, the respondents have not taken any action for vacating the beneficiaries from the land in question. Only on the apprehension, the petitioner has filed this Writ Petition.

4.In the light of the aforesaid submissions made on either side, we are of the considered view that the allegation of the petitioner is only based on the apprehension. Further, the petitioner has not satisfied the rules and norms framed for filing a Writ Petition as Public Interest Litigation and therefore, we



W.P.(MD) No.3563 of 2023

are not inclined to entertain this Writ Petition.

5. At this juncture, it is appropriate to refer to the following observation made by the Apex Court in ***Ashok Kumar Pandey vs. State of West Bengal and others*** reported in (2004) 3 SCC 349, the Apex Court at paragraphs 5 to 16, held as follows:-

“16. As noted supra, a time has come to weed out the petitions, which though titled as public interest litigations are in essence something else. It is shocking to note that courts are flooded with a large number of so-called public interest litigations, whereas only a minuscule percentage can legitimately be called as public interest litigations. Though the parameters of public interest litigation have been indicated by this Court in a large number of cases, yet unmindful of the real intentions and objectives, courts at times are entertaining such petitions and wasting valuable judicial time which, as noted above, could be otherwise utilized for disposal of genuine cases. Though in Duryodhan Sahu (Dr) v. Jitendra Kumar Mishra (1998) 7 SCC 273, this Court held that in service matters PILs should not be entertained, the inflow of the so-called PILs involving service matters continues unabated in the courts and strangely are entertained. The least the High Courts



W.P.(MD) No.3563 of 2023

WEB COPY

could do is to throw them out on the basis of the said decision. This tendency is being slowly permitted to percolate for setting in motion criminal law jurisdiction, often unjustifiably just for gaining publicity and giving adverse publicity to their opponents. The other interesting aspect is that in the PILs, official documents are being annexed without even indicating as to how the petitioner came to possess them. In one case, it was noticed that an interesting answer was given as to its possession. It was stated that a packet was lying on the road and when out of curiosity the petitioner opened it, he found copies of the official documents. Apart from the sinister manner, if any, of getting such copies, the real brain or force behind such cases would get exposed to find out whether it was a bona fide venture. Whenever such frivolous pleas are taken to explain possession, the court should do well not only to dismiss the petitions but also to impose exemplary costs, as it prima facie gives impression about oblique motives involved, and in most cases shows proxy litigation. Where the petitioner has not even a remote link with the issues involved, it becomes imperative for the court to lift the veil and uncover the real purpose of the petition and the real person behind it. It would be desirable for the courts to filter out the frivolous petitions and dismiss them with costs as aforestated so that the message goes in the right direction that petitions filed with oblique motive do not have the approval of the courts.”



WEB COPY

W.P.(MD) No.3563 of 2023

6.Public interest litigation is an extremely important jurisdiction exercised by the Supreme Court and the High Courts. The Apex Court in ***Neetu v. State of Punjab, (2007) 1 SCC 614***, held that when a particular person is the object and target of a petition styled as public interest litigation, the Court has to be careful to see whether the attack in the guise of public interest is really intended to unleash a private vendetta, personal grouse or some other mala fide object.

7.That apart, in ***State of M.P. Vs. Narmada Bachao Andolan, (2011) 7 SCC 639***, the Apex Court has held as follows:-

"13. Strict rules of pleading may not apply in PIL, however, there must be sufficient material in the petition on the basis of which the court may proceed.

The PIL litigant has to lay a factual foundation for his averments on the basis of which such a person claims the reliefs. The information furnished by him should not be vague and indefinite.



W.P.(MD) No.3563 of 2023

WEB COPY

Proper pleadings are necessary to meet the requirements of the principles of natural justice. Even in PIL, the litigant cannot approach the court to have a fishing or roving enquiry. He cannot claim to have a chance to establish his claim. However, the technicalities of the rules of pleading cannot be made applicable vigorously. Pleadings prepared by a layman must be construed generously as he lacks the standard of accuracy and precision particularly when a legal wrong is caused to a determinate class.”

8.In the light of the decisions cited supra, we are not inclined to entertain this Writ Petition. Accordingly, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs.

[D.K.K., J.] & [L.V.G., J.]
22.02.2023

NCC : Yes / No

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

MYR

To

1.The District Collector,

Ramanathapuram District,

Ramanathapuram.

Page 7 of 9



W.P.(MD) No.3563 of 2023

WEB COPY

2.The Special Tahsildar,
Adi Dravidar Welfare Office,
Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD) No.3563 of 2023

D.KRISHNAKUMAR, J.
AND
L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

MYR

W.P.(MD)No.3563 of 2023

22.02.2023

Page 9 of 9