



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 34026 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.01.2024

CORAM

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

W.P. No. 34026 of 2023

and

W.M.P. Nos. 33897 and 33951 of 2023

Valarmathi

... Petitioner

-VS-

1. The Joint Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
Ariyalur Region,
Ariyalur.
2. Deputy Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
Ariyalur.
3. The President,
Vangudi Primary Agricultural Cooperative Credit Society,
Vangudi,
Udayar Palaiyam Taluk,
Ariyalur District.
4. The Secretary,
Vangudi Primary Agricultural Cooperative Credit Society,
Vangudi,
Udayar Palaiyam Taluk.

... Respondents

Prayer:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, 1950, praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records with respect of the impugned reply letter of the 2nd Respondent in Na.Ka.68/2022/Pu.Ma.(1) dated 23.02.2023 and impugned reply of the 4th Respondent letter dated 27.02.2023 to quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to extent the benefit of jewel loan waiver scheme by return back



W.P. No. 34026 of 2023

the petitioner's jewel to the petitioner within the stipulated time.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr. R.S.Selvam

For Respondents : Mr. B.Vijay (for R1 and R2)
Additional Government Pleader

Mr. S.Ravi Kumar (for R3 and R4)

ORDER

Heard Mr. R.S.Selvam, Learned Counsel for the Petitioner, Mr. B.Vijay, Learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the First and Second Respondent, Mr. S.Ravi Kumar, Learned Counsel appearing for the Third and Fourth Respondents, and perused the materials placed on record, apart from the pleadings of the parties.

2. It is the case of the Petitioner that she is a member of the co-operative society of the Third and Fourth Respondents, from whom she had availed an agricultural loan for which she had pledged jewels as security and was entitled to the waiver of the outstanding amount in that loan relying on G.O. (Ms.) No. 97, Co-operation, Food and Consumer Protection Department dated 01.11.2021 issued by the Government of Tamil Nadu for which she had sent a legal notice dated 02.02.2023 through her advocate, but the benefit claimed has been denied



W.P. No. 34026 of 2023

by Proceedings in Na.Ka.68/2022/Pu.Ma(1) dated 23.02.2023, which is assailed in this Writ Petition.

3. The Petitioner is entitled to seek a reference under Section 90(1)(b) of the Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1983, to determine any dispute touching the business of a co-operative society arising between it and its member, as in this case, before the jurisdictional Registrar of Co-operative Societies, who has also been empowered to condone delay in filing the same after the prescribed period of limitation has expired, if sufficient cause is made out.

4. It must, at once, be emphasized that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Assistant Collector of Central Excise -vs- Dunlop India Limited* [(1985) 1 SCC 260] has precisely explained the legal position relating to the exercise of discretionary powers under writ jurisdiction when an alternative remedy exists, in the following words:-

"3. Article 226 is not meant to short-circuit or circumvent statutory procedures. It is only where statutory remedies are entirely ill-suited to meet the demands of extraordinary situations as for instance where the very vires of the statute is in question or



W.P. No. 34026 of 2023

WEB COPY

where private or public wrongs are so inextricably mixed up and the prevention of public injury and the vindication of public justice require it that recourse may be had to Article 226 of the Constitution. But then the Court must have good and sufficient reason to by-pass the alternative remedy provided by statute. Surely matters involving the revenue where statutory remedies are available are not such matters. We can also take judicial notice of the fact that the vast majority of the petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution are filed solely for the purpose of obtaining interim orders and thereafter prolong the proceedings by one device or the other. The practice certainly needs to be strongly discouraged.”

In ***Nivedita Sharma -vs- Cellular Operators Association of India*** [(2011) 14 SCC 337], advertent to the previous decisions with regard to the rule of self-restraint when an alternative remedy is available to the aggrieved person, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has emphasized that when a statutory forum is created by law for redressal of grievance, a Writ Petition should not be ordinarily entertained ignoring that statutory dispensation. Further, the law has been restated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Radha Krishan Industries -vs- State of Himachal Pradesh*** [(2021) 6 SCC 771] as extracted



W.P. No. 34026 of 2023

WEB COPY

27.1. *The power under Article 226 of the Constitution to issue writs can be exercised not only for the enforcement of fundamental rights, but for any other purpose as well.*

27.2. *The High Court has the discretion not to entertain a writ petition. One of the restrictions placed on the power of the High Court is where an effective alternate remedy is available to the aggrieved person.*

27.3. *Exceptions to the rule of alternate remedy arise where : (a) the writ petition has been filed for the enforcement of a fundamental right protected by Part III of the Constitution; (b) there has been a violation of the principles of natural justice; (c) the order or proceedings are wholly without jurisdiction; or (d) the vires of a legislation is challenged.*

27.4. *An alternate remedy by itself does not divest the High Court of its powers under Article 226 of the Constitution in an appropriate case though ordinarily, a writ petition should not be entertained when an efficacious alternate remedy is provided by law.*

27.5. *When a right is created by a statute, which itself*



W.P. No. 34026 of 2023

WEB COPY

prescribes the remedy or procedure for enforcing the right or liability, resort must be had to that particular statutory remedy before invoking the discretionary remedy under Article 226 of the Constitution. This rule of exhaustion of statutory remedies is a rule of policy, convenience and discretion.

27.6. *In cases where there are disputed questions of fact, the High Court may decide to decline jurisdiction in a writ petition. However, if the High Court is objectively of the view that the nature of the controversy requires the exercise of its writ jurisdiction, such a view would not readily be interfered with.”*

In such circumstances, the Petitioner has not been impeded from canvassing what is sought to be agitated in this Writ Petition in the aforesaid statutory remedy and there is no acceptable explanation from the Petitioner for not having availed it.

5. When the said legal position was pointed out to Learned Counsel for the Petitioner, he seeks permission of the Court to withdraw the Writ Petition with liberty to resort to the aforesaid procedure. He has also made an endorsement to that effect in the court record.

In the result, the Writ Petition is dismissed as withdrawn granting such



W.P. No. 34026 of 2023

liberty. It is made that clear for the purpose of reckoning limitation for availing the aforesaid remedy, the period from the date of filing of the Writ Petitions, viz., 29.11.2023, till the date on which the certified copy of this order is made ready by the Registry, shall be excluded. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

10.01.2024

Index: Yes/No

NCC: Yes/No

gsa

Note: Issue order copy by 26.03.2024.

To

1. The Joint Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
Ariyalur Region,
Ariyalur.
2. Deputy Registrar of Cooperative Societies,
Ariyalur.
3. The President,
Vangudi Primary Agricultural Cooperative Credit Society,
Vangudi,
Udayar Palaiyam Taluk,
Ariyalur District.
4. The Secretary,
Vangudi Primary Agricultural Cooperative Credit Society,
Vangudi,
Udayar Palaiyam Taluk.



WEB COPY



W.P. No. 34026 of 2023

P.D. AUDIKESAVALU, J.

gsa

W.P. No. 34026 of 2023

10.01.2024