



Review Application No.62 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **22.07.2024**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.**JUSTICE R.SUBRAMANIAN**

**and**

THE HONOURABLE MR.**JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN**

**Review Application No.62 of 2024**

**in W.P.No.9715 of 2023**

V.Anima Malar

.. Petitioner

-VS-

1. S.Aadhavan

2. The Member Secretary,  
Directorate of Rural Development Agency,  
Panagal Building, Saithapet,  
Chennai 600 015.

3. The District Collector,  
Office of the Collector of Ariyalur,  
Ariyalur District.

4. The Assistant Director,  
Directorate of Rural Development Agency,  
Office of the Collector of Ariyalur,  
Ariyalur District.

5. The Block Development Officer,  
Thirumanur, Ariyalur District.

6. The President,  
Thirumanur Panchayath,  
Ariyalur District.

.. Respondents



Review Application No.62 of 2024

Review Petition filed under Order XXXVII Rule 1 R/w Section 114 of CPC to review the order dated 29.03.2023 passed in W.P.No.9715 of 2023 on the file of this Court.

For the Petitioner : Mr.R.Venkatesulu

For the Respondents : Mr.R.Veeramani  
for R-1  
: Mr.Stalin Abimanyu  
Addl. G.P. for RR 2 to 6

\* \* \* \* \*

**ORDER**

**(made by R.SUBRAMANIAN, J.)**

Review is sought for on the ground that the petitioner in the writ petition has not disclosed the fact that he has already filed a suit seeking mandatory injunction to remove the construction.

2. While it is the case of the petitioner in the writ petition that the 6th respondent in the writ petition had constructed without planning permission, the learned counsel for the 6th respondent in the writ petition/review petitioner would submit that the construction put up by the petitioner in the writ petition is also without planning permission.



Review Application No.62 of 2024

WEB COPY

3. Mr.Veeramani, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in the writ petition would submit that he has got a proper plan approval and the construction has been put up only after obtaining the planning approval.

4. Be that as it may, the pendency of the suit for mandatory injunction for removal of the construction will not in any way affect the functions of the authorities concerned under the relevant building rules to remove the unauthorised construction.

5. Therefore, we do not see any reason to entertain the review petition. The review petition is dismissed. No costs.

(R.S.M., J.) (V.L.N., J.)  
22.07.2024

Index : Yes/No  
NC : Yes/No

sra



WEB COPY



Review Application No.62 of 2024

**R.SUBRAMANIAN, J.**

and

**V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.**

(sra)

To

1. The Member Secretary,  
Directorate of Rural Development Agency,  
Panagal Building, Saithapet, Chennai 600 015.
2. The District Collector,  
Office of the Collector of Ariyalur,  
Ariyalur District.
3. The Assistant Director,  
Directorate of Rural Development Agency,  
Office of the Collector of Ariyalur, Ariyalur District.
4. The Block Development Officer,  
Thirumanur, Ariyalur District.

**Review Appln.No.62 of 2024**

**22.07.2024**