



Cont.P.No.2827 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.04.2024

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.S.SUNDAR
AND
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN

Contempt Petition No.2827 of 2023

P.S.Srinivasan

.. Petitioner

v.

1. Dr.J.Radhakrishnan, I.A.S.,
The Commissioner
Greater Chennai Corporation
Rippon Building
Chennai 600 003
2. Mr.G.Baskar
The Assistant Executive Engineer
Greater Chennai Corporation
Zone-9, Chennai
3. Ms.S.Anitha
Zonal Officer
Zone-IX, Teynampet
No.4, 4th Cross Street
Lake View Road
Chennai 600 034



Cont.P.No.2827 of 2023

4. Mr.S.Pradeepkumar
The Executive Engineer
Greater Chennai Corporation
Zone-9, Chennai 600 034

5. Thiru.Anshul Mishra, I.A.S.,
The Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority
rep.by its Member Secretary
Thalamuthu Natarajan Maaligai
Gandhi Irwin Road
Egmore, Chennai 600 008

.. Respondents

Contempt Petition is filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 praying to punish the respondents for willful disobedience of the order dated 28.03.2023 made in W.P.No.14331 of 2019.

For Petitioner :: Mr.T.Sellapandian

For Respondents :: Mr.A.C.Manibharathi
Standing Counsel for R1 to R4
Mr.R.Sivakumar for R5

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by S.S.SUNDAR,J.)

This Court in W.P.No.5229 of 2024 filed by one Mr.M.Loganathan, who is the eighth respondent in W.P.No.14331 of 2019, passed an order on 29.02.2024 in the following lines:-

“3. Be that as it may, the petitioner states that he has



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.2827 of 2023

preferred a revision before the 1st respondent on 23.01.2024 under Section 80-A of the Tamil Nadu Town and Country Planning Act, 1971, against the order of the 3rd respondent. This Court, in similar circumstances, has directed the State to consider the revision filed by the petitioners therein and to maintain status quo till such time the Statutory revision is disposed of in one way or the other. Having regard to the consistent view taken by this Court, this Court is inclined to issue the following directions:

- i. The 1st respondent is directed to consider and dispose of the Statutory revision stated to have been filed by the petitioner before the 1st respondent under Section 80-A of the Tamil Nadu Town and Country Planning Act, 1971, on merits and in accordance with law, within a period of twelve weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, and communicate the decision to the petitioner.
- ii. Till such time the 1st respondent disposes of the revision and passes orders on merits in the revision petition, the respondents are directed to maintain status quo and no coercive action needs to be taken pursuant to the order which is the subject matter of



Cont.P.No.2827 of 2023

challenge in the revision petition.”

WEB COPY

2. The learned Standing Counsel appearing for the Corporation states that by virtue of the order passed by this Court to maintain status quo till the statutory revision stated to have been filed by the eighth respondent is disposed of on merits, the respondents are unable to take action.

3. Considering the nature of order passed by this Court and on account of the intervening order passed by a co-equal Bench in the writ petition filed by the eighth respondent, this contempt petition stands closed.

Index : yes/no
Neutral citation : yes/no

(S.S.S.R.,J.) (V.L.N.,J.)
26.04.2024

SS



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.2827 of 2023

S.S.SUNDAR,J.
AND

V.LAKSHMINARAYANAN,J.

SS

Cont.P.No.2827 of 2023

26.04.2024