



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 16.12.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
and M.P.Nos.1, 1 of 2015

W.P.No.32432 of 2015:-

Pappathi @ Marayal

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. The Chairman,
Chennai Port Trust,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai-600 001.

2. The Accounts Officer (Pension),
Chennai Port Trust,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai-600 001.

3. P.Deeba

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 and 2 to disburse the Death-cum-Pensionary benefits of the petitioner's husband late S.Annadurai who died in harness as Mazdoor on 16.06.2015 by considering her representation dated 07.08.2015.

For Petitioner	: Ms.M.Adhishree for Mr.N.Manokaran
For R1 and R2	: Ms.A.K.Kalpana for M/s Babitha Sunil
For R3	: Mr.CH.Mohithsai



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

W.P.No.32433 of 2015:-

Pappathi @ Marayal

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. The Chief Manager,
Life Insurance Corporation of India,
City Branch-13,
Bombay Mutual Building,
232, NSC Bose Road, Chennai-1.

2. The Branch Manager,
Life Insurance Corporation of India,
City Branch-13,
Bombay Mutual Building,
232, NSC Bose Road, Chennai-1.

3. P.Deeba

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 and 2 to disburse the life insurance policy amount of the petitioner's husband late S.Annadurai who died in harness as Mazdoor on 16.06.2015 by considering her representation dated 07.08.2015.

For Petitioner	: Ms.M.Adhishree for Mr.N.Manokaran
For R1 and R2	: Ms.P.Vijayalakshmi
For R3	: Mr.CH.Mohithsai

W.P.No.8466 of 2016:-

P.Deepa

... Petitioner

-Vs-



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

1. The Chairman,
Chennai Port Trust,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai-600 001.

2. The Accounts Officer (Pension),
Chennai Port Trust,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai-600 001.

3. Pappathi @ Marayal

... Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents 1 and 2 to disburse the death cum pensionary benefits of the deceased Annadurai to the petitioner being the legal wife within a time frame fixed by this Hon'ble Court.

For Petitioner : Mr.CH.Mohithsai
For R1 and R2 : Ms.A.K.Kalpana
for M/s Babitha Sunil

For R3 : N.S.Suganthan

COMMON ORDER

W.P.No.32432 of 2015 has been filed for direction directing the respondents 1 and 2 to disburse the Death-cum-Pensionary benefits of the petitioner's late husband S.Annadurai who died in harness as Mazdoor on 16.06.2015 by considering her representation dated 07.08.2015.



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

2. W.P.No.32433 of 2015 has been filed for direction directing the

respondents 1 and 2 to disburse the life insurance policy amount of the petitioner's late husband S.Annadurai who died in harness as Mazdoor on 16.06.2015 by considering her representation dated 07.08.2015.

3. W.P.No.8466 of 2016 has been filed for direction directing the respondents 1 and 2 to disburse the death cum pensionary benefits of the deceased Annadurai to the petitioner being the legal wife within a time frame fixed by this Hon'ble Court.

4. Since the issues involved in all the three writ petitions are interconnected, the writ petitions are heard together and disposed of by this common order. For the sake of convenience, the parties are referred to as per their ranking in W.P. No.32432 of 2015.

5. One S.Annadurai who was working as Mazdoor in the office of the first respondent, died on 16.06.2015. Pursuant to his death, his terminal as well as pensionary benefits were not able to be settled in view of the rival claim made by the petitioner viz., Pappathi @ Marayal and



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016 the third respondent viz., P.Deepa who are respectively claiming to be the first wife of the deceased. The deceased Annadurai had taken six insurance policies from the Life Insurance Corporation, nominating his daughters viz., A.Bharani Priya and A.Pradiksha in three policies and nominating his wife viz., P.Deepa, in respect of the other three policies. The petitioner preferred two writ petitions. W.P.No.32432 of 2015 was filed to direct the respondents 1 and 2 to disburse the Death-cum-Pensionary benefits of the petitioner's husband and W.P.No.32433 of 2015 was filed to disburse the life insurance policy amount of the petitioner's late husband S.Annadurai to the petitioner based on her representations. In the meantime, through a communication dated 19.11.2015, the Chennai Port Trust had intimated the 3rd respondent to approach the Civil Court and obtain appropriate order regarding the marital status, challenging the same and for consequential direction to settle the death cum pensionary benefits, she had preferred the writ petition in W.P.No.8466 of 2016.

6. Ms.M.Adhishree, the learned counsel for the petitioner viz., Pappathi @ Marayal by placing reliance on the copy of the marriage



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
invitation dated 06.06.1988 enclosed in the typed set of papers,

contended that the deceased Annadurai had married the petitioner on 06.06.1988 itself and therefore, she is the first wife and a girl child viz., A.Sathya was born on 08.08.1989 out of their wedlock and the copy of the birth certificate is also enclosed. She further asserted her claim by relying on the community certificate dated 15.06.2004 issued to her daughter and the aadhaar card of the petitioner and her daughter and the education certificates stating that she is the first wife and the said A.Sathya was born to her and the deceased.

7. She further contended that on the date of death of the deceased, she was present in the house and had lodged a complaint. Based on her complaint, FIR in Crime No.729 of 2015 was registered on 16.06.2015. Relying on the postmortem certificate and other statements, the learned counsel for the petitioner asserted that she is the first wife and is therefore entitled to claim the death-cum-pensionary benefits and life insurance policy amount of her deceased husband. It is her further contention that in respect of registration of FIR, the third respondent viz., P.Deepa had given statement admitting that she is the second wife of



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
Annadurai and therefore, she submitted that the respondents ought to have settled the benefits, since the same has not been done, necessary orders to that effect may be passed.

8. She also relied on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of *Sarbati Devi and another Vs Usha Devi reported in 1984 (1) SCC 424*, for the proposition that the nominee receives the Insurance policy amount only as a trustee, which in turn is bound to be distributed to the legal heirs.

9. Mr.C.H.Mohithsai, the learned counsel for the third respondent and the petitioner in W.P.No.8466 of 2016, submitted that the marriage between P.Deepa and the deceased Annadurai was solemnized on 22.11.1996. Out of their wedlock, two daughters viz., Bharanipriya and Pradiksha, were born on 12.09.1997 and 24.04.2001 respectively. The learned counsel, relying on the marriage invitation and the birth certificates of the two daughters, submitted that the said P.Deepa is the legally wedded wife and that the two children were born out of their marriage. He further placed reliance on the community certificate issued



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
to the daughters, the family card issued by the Civil Supplies Consumer

Protection Department and the Voter ID card, asserting that the claim of the said P.Deepa alone is justified. Further, the learned counsel submitted that in fact even the first respondent, Chennai Port Trust, had identified the said P.Deepa as the legal heir and had issued an identity card by listing the said Deepa, the two children and the mother of the deceased Annadurai as legal heirs. Further, when the deceased applied for passport for his wife, the Chennai Port Trust had issued an identity certificate along with No Objection Certificate. For all practical purpose and as per official records, the said P.Deepa alone is recognized as the wife of the deceased.

10. It is the further contention that the deceased himself had nominated the said P.Deepa and her two children as legal heirs to receive the gratuity and pensionary benefits from the Port Trust. Further, the deceased himself had taken three Life Insurance Policies nominating his two children and three Policies nominating his wife, all of which had matured and the Insurance Corporation had rightly settled the claim. Apart from the above, the Tahsildar, Perambur Taluk, has issued the



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

Legal Heirship certificate of the deceased Annadurai, certifying the 3rd

respondent and her daughters as the legal heirs.

11. While being so, based on the illegal claim made by some third party, when the claim of the third respondent is borne out by records, the Port Trust, through the impugned communication had erroneously relegated the third respondent to approach the Civil Court, which was not necessitated. Further, the learned counsel disputed the copy of the marriage certificate submitted by the petitioner and the statement which was relied on. He also pointed out discrepancies in the birth certificate and the Transfer Certificate and also there is a discrepancy in the community details. It is for the petitioner to establish her claim, if it is genuine, before the appropriate forum and without doing so, benefits for which the third respondent and the legal heirs are entitled cannot be curtailed and sought for appropriate orders.

12. The learned counsel for the Life Insurance Corporation, relying on the counter affidavit, submitted that six policies had been taken by the deceased Annadurai, three nominating his wife P.Deepa and



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
three nominating his daughters viz, Bharanipriya and Pradiksha. Since all the insurance policies had matured long back, even prior to filing of these writ petitions, five policies had been settled. However, due to disputes, one policy has been kept pending without payment. When the policies are taken by nominating the said Deepa in three policies and his daughters in three policies, the Corporation is bound to settle the claims based on the nominations, which was rightly done. If at all the petitioner has any grievance or is entitled to make a claim, it is for her to go before the appropriate forum. Therefore, the learned counsel sought for dismissal of this writ petition.

13. M/s A.K.Kalpana, learned counsel for the first respondent, relying on the counter affidavit contended that as per the service records of the respondents, the said P.Deepa is the wife and the said Bharani Priya and Pradiksha are the daughters of the deceased employee viz., Annadurai. Further, in the Form VII application filed by the deceased for grant of family pension, the deceased had nominated P.Deepa as his wife and the said Bharani Priya and Pradiksha as children. Similarly, in Form VIII, P.Deepa was nominated for grant of death-cum-retirement gratuity.



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

As such, all the records show that the third respondent and the two children are the legal heirs of the deceased. However, since the petitioner had made a claim by enclosing certain documents, the first respondent had sent a communication to the third respondent, advising them to approach the Civil Court and obtain appropriate orders, as they are not the proper authority to resolve the issues concerning the claim of the first wife.

14. Heard the rival submissions and perused the materials available on record.

15. The following facts are not in dispute:

i. Annadurai worked as Mazdoor in the office of the first respondent, Chennai Port Trust and died on 16.06.2015.

ii. Annadurai filed Form VII application for grant of family pension, by nominating the 3rd respondent/P.Deepa as his wife and the said A.Bharani Priya and A.Pradiksha as his daughters.

iii. Annadurai also filed Form VIII application, nominating the 3rd respondent/P.Deepa as his wife to receive death-cum-retirement gratuity.

iv. Form IX was also filed by the deceased Annadurai, nominating



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
the said P.Deepa and two daughters, for payment of family pension and death-cum-retirement gratuity.

v. During his lifetime, Annadurai had applied for passport for his wife viz., the third respondent and the first respondent issued an identity certificate on 02.07.2007, certifying that P.Deepa (Wife), A.Bharani Priya and A.Pradiksha (Daughters) were dependent family members of the said S.Annadurai and a no objection certificate was also issued for acquiring passport.

vi. The Tahsildar, Perambur Taluk, has issued Legal heirship Certificate certifying the 3rd respondent P.Deepa (Wife), A.Bharani Priya and A.Pradiksha (Daughters) as the legal heirs of Annadurai.

16. The perusal of the above documents which have been submitted by the deceased Annadurai and available in the office of the first respondent, along with the Legal heirship certificate issued by the statutory authority, which all remain unchallenged, makes it evident that the 3rd respondent/P.Deepa is the wife and A.Bharani Priya and A.Pradiksha are the daughters of deceased Annadurai.



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

17. Further, the third respondent, who is the petitioner in

W.P.No.8466 of 2016 had filed birth certificates of her two daughters dated 09.12.1999 and 04.09.2001, along with their community certificates dated 23.04.2003. Further Ration card and voter ID card issued by the respective departments had also been enclosed to establish that she is the wife of Annadurai and the two daughters were born to him. The 1st respondent had also issued the Family identity card dated 13.11.2001, listing the third respondent, the two daughters and the mother of the deceased one Kandhayee as the legal heirs of Annadurai. Based on these available documents, including the nomination forms, the first respondent had consistently acknowledged the third respondent and two daughters as the legal heirs. However, by the impugned communication, the 1st respondent had intimated the 3rd respondent to approach the Civil Court to declare her status in view of the rival claim made by the petitioner.

18. On the contrary, the petitioner, Pappathi @ Marayal, in support of her claim has submitted a copy of the marriage invitation card dated 06.06.1988, the birth certificate dated 19.08.1989 of A.Sathya and



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016 education certificates. The petitioner is relying on these documents to assert her claim as the first wife. However, merely by relying on the copy of the marriage invitation or the birth certificate enclosed in the typed set of papers, it cannot be decided as to whether the petitioner is the wife of Annadurai and whether his marriage had occurred on the date as mentioned in the invitation.

19. By pointing out the discrepancies in the date of birth of A.Sathya, the learned counsel for the third respondent submitted that when the date of birth is mentioned as 08.08.1989 in the birth certificate, in the copy of the Transfer Certificate, it is mentioned as 08.06.1989. Therefore, the claim made placing reliance on these documents regarding marriage cannot be accepted and it is for the petitioner to establish the same.

20. Further, the learned counsel also pointed out the discrepancy in the community certificate filed by the petitioner for her daughter A.Sathya, which does not match the community of the deceased Annadurai. As such, the third respondent strongly disputed the



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
petitioner's claim, asserting that neither the petitioner is the wife nor is

A.Sathya a child born out of any such marriage.

21. The petitioner mainly relies on FIR registered at the time of death of Annadurai based on her complaint and claims that she is his wife. Even though the petitioner Pappathi @ Marayal seems to have been present at the time of death of the said Annadurai and lodged a complaint, which led to the registration of FIR in Crime No.729 of 2015, no conclusion can be drawn solely on this regard, as to whether the petitioner/Pappathi @ Marayal is the legally wedded wife, much less the first wife. Further a typed letter without any signature, filed in the typed set of papers projecting as though admission of the 3rd respondent that she is the second wife cannot be accepted. When all the above mentioned documents including the Legal Heirship Certificate are against the claim of the petitioner and the petitioner has also not chosen to challenge any of those documents, then the claim of the petitioner to be the first wife simply based on the copies of documents in the typed set of papers, cannot be sustained. If the petitioner possesses all the necessary documents to establish that she is the legally wedded first wife of the said



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
Annadurai and A.Sathya was born out of their wedlock, it is for the petitioner to establish her claim and declare her status by approaching the competent Civil Court. Admittedly till date, no such claim has been made by the petitioner, particularly when the deceased himself nominated the 3rd respondent and his 2 daughters to receive all the gratuity and pensionary benefits from the first respondent.

22. In so far as the Life Insurance Corporation policies taken by the deceased Annadurai are concerned, the deceased himself nominated the third respondent P.Deepa, as his wife to receive the maturity amount for three policies and nominated his two daughters to receive the maturity amount for the other three policies.

23. The details of the policies are explained hereunder:-

SI.No	Policy Nos.	Date of Commencement	Sum Assured	Nominee/s	Date of Settlement	Amount Settled Rs.
1.	716813619	20/06/2002	Rs.50000/-	A.Deepa	18/08/2015	50000/-
2.	716812326	20/02/2002	Rs.100000/-	A.Deepa	18/08/2015	98960/-
3.	715921051	17/08/2010	Rs.250000/-	A.Bharani	26/08/2015	296000/-
4.	715952247	20/03/1999	Rs.50000/-	A.Deepa	18/08/2015	86857/-



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

					5	
5.	715955744	20/10/2000	Rs.50000/-	A Bharani Priya	18/08/2015	48936/- 56500/-
6.	719852033	21/03/2013	Rs.150000/-	A Pradiksha	Policy which is in written back status	Written back status

24. From the above, it can be seen that in fact all the policies had matured even prior to filing of the writ petition and the Life Insurance Corporation had also settled five of the policies as per the nominations made. However, in respect of one of the policies, the payment has been kept pending, in view of the present writ petitions instituted by the petitioner. When the policies were taken by the deceased and he nominated the third respondent as the beneficiary for three policies and his daughters as beneficiaries for the other three policies, the LIC, upon maturity of these policies or in the case of death, is bound to make these payments either to the applicant or to the nominee.

25. In the instant case, since the applicant has died, the maturity amount has been rightly settled as per the nominations. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that even though the third respondent



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
has been nominated, she is entitled to receive the maturity amount only

as a trustee and therefore, she is liable to distribute it to the legal heirs.

Merely because the amount has been settled to the third respondent, she cannot appropriate the amount for herself. In this regard, absolutely there cannot be any disagreement with respect to the proposition that the maturity amount handed over to the nominees is to be held by them only as trustees, which they are liable to distribute to the eligible legal heirs.

26. However in the present case, the petitioner claims to be the wife and that her daughter A.Sathya was born out of wedlock with Annadurai but the same is yet to be established by her. Unless it is determined that the petitioner and her daughter are legal heirs, the claim to settle the policy amount to them does not arise. It is for the petitioner to institute appropriate proceedings to declare her status as wife/legal heir of deceased Annadurai and in the event of succeeding, it is always open to her to make a claim to the third respondent or other nominees to distribute the maturity amount received by them to all the legal heirs.

1. Even though the parties are to be relegated to the Civil Court to



WEB COPY

W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016 resolve the rival claims regarding the status of the first wife, however, the status of the 3rd respondent and her 2 daughters as legal heirs of deceased employee Annadurai is fortified by overwhelming documents available on record. Whereas the petitioner is yet to even substantiate the marriage with deceased Annadurai to sustain her claim as first wife, particularly when the nomination application filed by the deceased before the 1st respondent, legal heirship certificate and other documents remain unchallenged. When admittedly the petitioner till date has not even initiated any proceedings to prove her marriage with deceased Annadurai, the 3rd respondent and her daughters cannot be endlessly denied the benefits. Further considering the fact that nearly 10 years have passed since the death of the deceased employee and the filing of the present writ petition, it would not be appropriate to simply relegate the 3rd respondent to civil court at this point of time without balancing the interests as the entire terminal and pensionary benefits of the deceased is not able to be received by the admitted legal heirs, who are borne out by records.

2.



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

WEB COPY

28. The first respondent was directed to file the status showing the amounts that are pending with them in respect of gratuity, pension arrears due to the death of the said Annadurai. Pursuant to the direction, the first respondent had filed the following report today:-

“With reference to the above, the amount to be disbursed/settled to the legal heirs is furnished below for further action at your end please.

		Rs.
Gratuity	-	6,83,550.00
Gross Family Pension		
Arrears		
(17.06.2015 to 30.11.2024)	-	25,95,652.00

Total		32,79,202.00

Deduction (Chpt Co-opBank)	-	1,53,754.00

Net to be paid	-	31,25,448.00
Pension from December'24		
will be	-	29,138.00

29. From the report it could be seen that a sum of Rs.6,83,550/- is available with the first respondent which is payable towards gratuity and also a sum of Rs.25,95,652/- is available towards the pension arrears payable from 17.06.2015 to 30.11.2024 and also there is a deduction to



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
be paid to the Co-operative Bank to a sum of Rs.1,53,754/-. The pension
calculated to be paid from December, 2024 has been arrived at
Rs.29,138/-.

30. As referred earlier, the petitioner only claims to be the first wife of deceased employee Annadurai without the marriage itself having been established and disputes the status of the 3rd respondent as second wife. Considering the fact that the deceased S.Annadurai had nominated his wife/ 3rd respondent and two daughters as legal heirs to receive the benefits and the documents referred above including the legal heirship certificate prove their status, the benefits payable to them cannot be withheld. They have already been deprived of receiving these benefits for an extended period of time. However, even though the petitioner has till date not initiated any proceedings to declare her marital status with Annadurai, this Court by considering the documents placed on record and the rival claim made to balance the interest of both the parties, feels that appropriate directions could be passed.



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

31. In view of the above deliberations, the following order is

passed:-

(i) The claim made in W.P. No.32433 of 2015 is rejected and the third respondent and her daughters who are the nominees as per the insurance policy are entitled to receive the maturity amount from the Life Insurance Corporation. However in the event of the petitioner and her daughter being declared as legal heirs of deceased Annadurai, they will be entitled for a share from the maturity amount received by the 3rd respondent and her daughters from LIC, as they will be holding the same as trustees which is to be distributed among the legal heirs.

(ii) Since the two daughters of the third respondent viz., Bharani Priya and Pradiksha are the legal heirs of the deceased Annadurai and had also been nominated to receive the gratuity and pensionary benefits along with their Mother/3rd respondent and both of them are studying, the first respondent is directed to settle 50% of the gratuity amount and also 50% of the arrears of pension lying from 17.06.2015 to 30.11.2024, after deducting the payments to be made to the Co-operative Bank to the 3rd respondent/P.Deepa and her 2 daughters viz.Bharani Priya and Pradiksha.



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

WEB COPY

(iii) 50% of the pension amount from the month of December, 2024 will also be distributed to the 3rd respondent/P.Deepa and her 2 daughters viz.Bharani Priya and Pradiksha, proportionately as per the pension rules in force.

(iv) Liberty is given to the petitioner/ Pappathi @Marayal to institute proceedings before the appropriate forum to declare her marital status with deceased Annadurai and the legal heirship of the petitioner and her daughter, within a period of two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

(v) In the event of the petitioner not being able to obtain any interim protection from the appropriate Court in respect of disbursal of the balance 50% of the gratuity and pensionary benefits, it is open to the first respondent to disburse the balance amount also to the 3rd respondent and her daughters. However, the petitioner and her daughter will be at liberty to make necessary claim, as per the ultimate final decision rendered in the proceedings to be initiated by them.



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

WEB COPY

(vi) It is made clear that if any such claim is made by the petitioner before the appropriate Civil Court, the same will be looked into and considered on its own merits, without being influenced by any of the observations made in this order.

32. Accordingly, W.P. No.32433 of 2015 is dismissed, W.P. Nos.32432 of 2015 and W.P. No.8466 of 2016 are disposed of with the aforesaid directions. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs.

16.12.2024

Internet: Yes
Index : Yes/No
Speaking/Non Speaking order
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
mn



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

To

WEB COPY

1. The Chairman,
Chennai Port Trust,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai-600 001.
2. The Accounts Officer (Pension),
Chennai Port Trust,
Rajaji Salai, Chennai-600 001.
3. The Chief Manager,
Life Insurance Corporation of India,
City Branch-13,
Bombay Mutual Building,
232, NSC Bose Road, Chennai-1.
4. The Branch Manager,
Life Insurance Corporation of India,
City Branch-13,
Bombay Mutual Building,
232, NSC Bose Road, Chennai-1.



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016
G.ARUL MURUGAN, J.

mn

W.P.Nos.32432 and 32433 of 2015 and 8466 of 2016

16.12.2024