



W.P.No.29934 of 2024

WEB COPY **C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.**

Today, the matter is listed under the caption “for being mentioned”.

2. In continuation of the earlier order of this Court dated 13.11.2024, passed in W.P.No.29934 of 2024, paragraph Nos.3 & 4 of the order may be substituted as follows:

“3.It is contended that the procurement in auction bid details are governed by the State of Tamil Nadu under the E-National Agricultural Market. The principle behind the formation of the agricultural market was to make payment directly to the farmers and to avoid middlemen and to benefit the farmers. It is claimed that the petitioner purchased cotton through various auctions conducted on behalf of the farmers. He had been procuring cotton originally from Thuraiyur Regulated Market, Manachanallur Regulated Market and Kumbakonam Regulated Market. On receipt of the material, he had to make payments to the respective regulated market. He claimed that he had been contacted by the 4th respondent - R.Gopal, who was acting as a middleman of the Committee and Society and was selling materials to various traders in Tamil Nadu like the petitioner. It is contended that the



petitioner was making payments regularly for the cotton purchased as per the bills furnished to him. He found in September 2023, there was a discrepancy in the bills and in the materials were supplied. Therefore, he asked the 4th respondent to clarify the difference.

4.The petitioner made a representation to the 3rd respondent, the Manager, Mayiladuthurai Agricultural Producers Co-operative Marketing Society, Mayiladuthurai, by letter dated 28.03.2024 and requested details of the date and place of auction and the list of details and the price list and the name of the farmers whose goods were kept in the auction. The said particulars had not been submitted to the petitioner. The petitioner also sent a legal notice dated 09.05.2024. A demand was raised by the 3rd respondent calling upon the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.31,78,369/-. The petitioner then approached the 3rd respondent, but however liberty was not granted to him. He then addressed a letter to the Chief Minister Cell. It is contended that the 1st respondent, the Deputy Registrar of Mayiladuthurai Co-operative Societies, had proceeded to attach the properties of the petitioner by proceedings under Section 167 of the Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1983. The petitioner had questioned that particular attachment by the 1st respondent in this writ petition.”



WEB COPY

3.The Registry may also substitute the following as 3rd respondent in the 'cause title' as well as in the 'To address' of the order:

3.The Manager,
Mayiladuthurai Agricultural Producers
- Co-operative Marketing Society,
Mayiladuthurai,
Cuddalore District.

4.All other observations made in the earlier order dated 13.11.2024, shall remain intact.

5.The Registry is directed to issue fresh order copy after carrying out necessary corrections.

11.03.2025

smv



WEB COPY



C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.

smv

W.P.No.29934 of 2024

11.03.2025