



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 5714 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.03.2024

CORAM

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

W.P. No. 5714 of 2024

and

W.M.P. Nos. 6319 and 6320 of 2024

R.Senthilvel Murugan

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. The Tamil Nadu State Information Commission,
Block No. 19, Government Farm Village,
Panepet,
Nandanam,
Chennai - 600 035.
 2. The District Revenue Officer,
O/o. the District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District.
 3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
O/o. the Revenue Divisional Office,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.
 4. The Public Information Officer/PA to the Revenue Divisional Officer,
O/s. the Revenue Divisional Office,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.
- ... Respondents

Prayer:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the entire records pertaining to the order dated 09.11.2023 of the First Respondent in Case



W.P. No. 5714 of 2024

No. NC909/C/2023 (SA.16459/C/2022) on the file of the First Respondent and quash the same.

For Petitioner : Mr. S.Saravanan

For Respondents : Mr. C.Vigneswaran,
Standing Counsel (for R1)

Mr. S.J.Mohamed Sathik,
Government Advocate (for R2 to R4)

ORDER

Heard Mr. S.Saravanan, Learned Counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. C.Vigneswaran, Learned Standing Counsel, who takes notice for the First Respondent, and Mr. S.J.Mohamed Sathik, Learned Government Advocate, who takes notice for the Second to Eighth Respondents, and perused the materials placed on record, apart from the pleadings of the parties.

2. The Writ Petition has been filed challenging order dated 09.11.2023 in Case No. NC909/C/2023 (SA.16459/C/2022) passed by the First Respondent imposing punishment on the Petitioner for non-compliance of the order passed by the First Respondent.



W.P. No. 5714 of 2024

3. It is borne out from the materials placed on record that the information has been sought from the Petitioner when he was working in Ramanathapuram District and he is now posted in Kanyakumari District situated within the territorial limits of jurisdiction of the Madurai Bench of this Court. The only reason stated by the Petitioner for approaching the Principal Seat of this Court instead of Madurai Bench is that the office of the First Respondent is located in Chennai. There cannot be any doubt that the First Respondent exercises powers for the whole of the State of Tamil Nadu, but it cannot mean as if the cause of action has arisen within the territorial limits of jurisdiction of the Principal Seat of this Court at Chennai. Even if it is assumed that a part of cause of action has arisen within the territorial limits of jurisdiction of this Court, the principle of *forum conveniens* would come into play as held by the Division Bench of this Court in **C.Ramesh -vs- Director General of Police** (Order dated 06.06.2013 in W.P. (MD) No. 8790 of 2013), as follows:-

“7. Exercise of jurisdiction is based on arising of the cause of action, either in whole or in part in any one of the said Revenue Districts. [See RAJASTHAN HIGH COURT ADVOCATES' ASSOCIATION Vs. UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS (2001 (2) SCC 294) and B.STALIN Vs. THE REGISTRAR, SUPREME COURT OF INDIA AND OTHERS (2012 (3) LW 489 (FB))].



8. *It should be remembered that the part of cause of action must be substantial in nature. The territorial jurisdiction of the Court is linked with the place of accrual of cause of action. [See U.P. RASHTRIYA CHINI MILL ADHIKARI PARISHAD, LUCKNOW Vs. STATE OF U.P. AND OTHERS (1995 (4) SCC 738)].*

9. *Referring to KUSUM INGOTS & ALLOYS LTD. Vs. UNION OF INDIA (2004 (3) CTC 365), a Full Bench of this Court in SANJOS JEWELLERS Vs. SYNDICATE BANK, BANGALORE AND OTHERS (2007 (5) CTC 305), held as under:-*

"30. We must, however, remind ourselves that even if a small part of cause of action arises within the territorial jurisdiction of the High Court, the same by itself may not be considered to be a determinative factor compelling the High Court to decide the matter on merit. In appropriate cases, the Court may refuse to exercise its discretionary jurisdiction by invoking the Doctrine of forum conveniens. [See BHAGAT SINGH BUGGA Vs. DEWAN JAGBIR SAWHNEY, AIR 1941 CAL 670 : ILR (1941) 1 CAL 490; MADANLAL JALAN Vs. MADANLAL, 1945 (49) CWN 357: AIR 1949 CAL 495;



W.P. No. 5714 of 2024

WEB COPY

BHARAT COKING COAL LTD. Vs. JHARIA TALKIES & COLD STORAGE (P) LTD., 1997 CWN 122; S.S.JAIN & CO. Vs. UNION OF INDIA, 1994 (1) CHN 445, and NEW HORIZONS LTD. Vs. UNION OF INDIA, AIR 1994 DEL 126]."

10. *Question of entertaining a lis disclosing a cause of action or part of cause of action is based on the averments contained in the affidavit etc. At that stage, the truth or otherwise of the averments need not be gone into. But, there must be necessary averments disclosing a cause of action, so that the Court can take cognizance of/entertaining the lis exposed in the petition for taking further action. [See OIL AND NATURAL GAS COMMISSION Vs. UTPAL KUMAR BASU AND OTHERS (1994 (4) SCC 711)].*

11. *A Court cannot arrogate/assume/confer upon itself a jurisdiction-territorial jurisdiction, when it has no such jurisdiction. Lack of jurisdiction to entertain a matter goes to the root of the matter, otherwise whatever action taken or orders passed by the Court becomes a nullity, it is non est and of no consequence at all resulting in wasting of precious public time.*



W.P. No. 5714 of 2024

Courts are barred from indulging in hypothetical and academic exercises.”

Having regard to the aforesaid legal position *viz-a-viz* factual matrix of this case, the cause of action for the Writ Petition, would have to be necessarily construed as having arisen wholly outside the territorial limits of jurisdiction of the Principal Bench of this Court, notwithstanding that the office of the First Respondent is located in Chennai.

4. When it is pointed out that the Writ Petition cannot be entertained in the Principal Seat of this Court in that backdrop, Learned Counsel for the Petitioner seeks permission of the Court to withdraw this Writ Petition with liberty to file fresh Writ Petition for the same relief before the Madurai Bench of this Court and he has made an endorsement to that effect in the court record.

In fine, the Writ Petition is dismissed as withdrawn granting such liberty. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed. No costs.

08.03.2024

Index: Yes/No

NCC: Yes/No

Note: Issue order copy by 08.03.2024.

vjt



W.P. No. 5714 of 2024

To

WEB COPY

1. The Commissioner,
Tamil Nadu State Information Commission,
Block No. 19, Government Farm Village,
Panepet,
Nandanam,
Chennai - 600 035.
2. The District Revenue Officer,
O/o. the District Collector,
Ramanathapuram District.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer,
O/o. the Revenue Divisional Office,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.
4. The Public Information Officer/PA to the Revenue Divisional Officer,
O/s. the Revenue Divisional Office,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 5714 of 2024

P.D. AUDIKESAVALU, J.

vjt

W.P. No. 5714 of 2024

08.03.2024