BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED : **11.06.2024**

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **N.SESHASAYEE**
and
THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE **L.VICTORIA GOWRI**

W.A(MD)No.747 of 2019
and CMP(MD)No.6572 of 2019

1.The District Collector,
Theni District,
Theni.

2.The District Revenue Officer,
O/o. the District Revenue Officer,
Theni District.

3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Periyakulam,
Theni District.

4.The Tahsildar,
Periyakulam Taluk,
Theni District. ...Appellants/Respondents

Vs.

M.Anbalagan ..Respondent/Petitioner

PRAYER: Writ Appeal is filed under Clause 15 of Letter Patent as against the order passed by this Court dated 05.03.2019 made in W.P(MD)No.17411 of 2015.

For Appellants : Mr.N.Muthu Vijayan
Special Government Pleader

For Respondent : No Appearance

JUDGMENT

[Judgment was delivered by **L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.**]

This Writ Appeal has been directed as against the order passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.(MD)No.17411 of 2015, dated 05.03.2019.

2.The factual background, which has led to the filing of this Writ Appeal are precisely as follows:-

(a)Since 1984, the respondent herein has been working as a Village Administrative Officer. A complaint of illegal gratification was made as against the respondent by one Mr.M.Sathyaraj on 30.01.2013, on the basis of which, the Vigilance and Anti-Corruption Department, Theni, had registered a criminal case in Crime No.2 of 2013 as against the respondent under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

(b)Following which, the second appellant had passed an order of suspension as against the respondent on 30.01.2013. Subsequently, vide proceedings dated 04.07.2013, the respondent was paid with subsistence allowance and dearness allowance from the date of suspension.

(c)On 31.05.2013, as he attained the age of superannuation, the second appellant vide proceedings in ROC.No.446/2013/A5 dated 31.05.2013, without allowing the respondent to retire, retained him in service, citing the pendency of criminal cases as against him. Further, the service rights of the respondent was freezed at the level reached on the date of superannuation, that is, 31.05.2013 afternoon, in view of the extension of his service and his salary during the period was ordered not to exceed the amount of pension which would have accrued to him on the said date.

(d)Hence, on 21.09.2015, after a period of two years, the respondent made a representation to the first appellant to provide pensionary and all other terminal benefits, which was not granted to him till that date. Since the same was not considered, he filed W.P.(MD)No.17411 of 2005 before this Court.

(e)The learned Single Judge, held that this Court has already dealt with the issue relating to sanction of retirement benefits, pension and interest on belated payment of the same in W.P.No.20107 of 2018 dated 28.02.2019 and the same is squarely applicable to the facts and circumstances of the respondent's case and having observed the same in paragraph Nos.20 and 22 of the order of this Court in W.P.No.20107 of 2018, the learned Single Judge proceeded to dispose of the Writ Petition directing the appellants to consider the claim of the respondent in line with the observations made in paragraph nos.4 to 20 of the order dated 28.02.2019 passed in W.P.No.20107 of 2018 and pay the benefits accordingly. As far as interest on belated payment of retiral benefits is concerned, the learned Single Judge further directed the appellants to pay interest at 8% per annum from the date of entitlement till the date of payment of the entire amount, failing which the same shall carry penal interest at 18% per annum for the default period.

(f)Assailing the same, the appellants are before us.

3.Heard the Special Government Pleader for the appellants, the learned counsel for the respondent and anxiously perused the materials available on record.

4.Feeling aggrieved with the action of the appellants withholding his pensionary and all other terminal benefits, the respondent had preferred the Writ Petition before this Court. Pursuant to the complaint made by one Mr.M.Sathyaraj, son of Muthuchamy, belonging to Lakshmipuram Village against the respondent that he had demanded a sum of Rs.7,000/- for change of patta for the property purchased by the said person, the Vigilance Authorities of the Vigilance and Anticorruption Wing, Theni had arrived on the spot and had seized an amount of Rs.7,000/- from one Kanaharaj who served as Village

Assistant along with the petitioner who had been the Village Administrative Officer since 1984. The Department of Vigilance and Anticorruption, Theni, had registered a criminal case in Crime No.2 of 2013 under Sections 7, 12, 13(2) r/w. 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 as against the respondent and the Village Assistant, namely Kanaharaj and had remanded them to judicial custody. On the same day, he was placed under suspension by the order of the second respondent vide proceedings in ROC.No.446/2013/A5 dated 30.01.2013. Though the respondent was paid with subsistence allowance and dearness allowance on attaining the age of superannuation on 31.05.2013, he was not allowed to retire and pensionary benefits were also not provided to him till date. The prosecution in respect of the aforesaid Crime No.2 of 2013 against the respondent is still pending.

5.The respondent made a representation after 2 years from the date of attaining superannuation on 21.09.2015 requiring the appellants to sanction his pensionary and all other terminal benefits, which was not considered, following which, he had filed the Writ Petition in W.P.(MD)No.17411 of 2015 before this Court, in which the learned Single Judge had allowed the respondent's Writ Petition and following which, the case is before us.

6.The learned Special Government Pleader categorically submitted that in view of the various provisions of Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978 and the Fundamental Rules of Government of Tamil Nadu, the decision of the appellants to withhold the pensionary and all other terminal benefits of the respondent pending disposal of the criminal proceeding as against him is well within the parameters of the service law and hence, pressed for interference of the order passed by the learned Single Judge.

7.Hence, the lucid question which has to be decided by us now is that, whether the appellant authorities are entitled to withhold the pensionary and all other terminal benefits of the respondent, in view of the pending criminal proceedings as against him, even after attaining the date of superannuation, that is, which falls on 31.05.2013, endlessly for more than a decade, without allowing him to retire?

8.Categorically answering the question “no”, the learned Single Judge relying upon the order passed by this Court in W.P.No.20107 of 2018 dated 28.02.2019 had allowed the Writ Petition and for better understanding, the paragraph nos.4 to 20 relied upon by the learned Single Judge of the aforesaid order is extracted herein as follows:-

"4.The Government, with an object to achieve for granting/sanctioning provisional pension immediately on the retirement of the Government servants, without causing undue delay, issued Government Orders periodically. Due to administrative reasons, such sanction was not done in time and hence, the Government decided to pay interest on all delayed payments of service benefits etc. The pension sanctioning authority was also directed to keep proper records of such interest payments and fix the responsibility for the delay caused on the person concerned.

5.In respect of interest, the rate of interest payable for the belated payment was also revised periodically in G.O.Ms.No.517, Finance (Pension) Department, dated 12.06.1987.

6.Expeditious disposal of Family Pension, Death-cum-retirement Gratuity and other terminal benefits payable to the family members of the Government servants dying in harness was taken into consideration and time limit for early settlement was also fixed by yet another G.O.Ms.No.86, Finance (Pension), dated 10th February, 1989.

7.Revised rate of interest on delayed payment of Death-cum-retirement Gratuity was also fixed in G.O.Ms.No.122 Finance (Pension) Department, dated 20th February, 1995.

8.By G.O.Ms.No.196 Finance (Pension) Department, dated

17.05.1999, the Government considered the need of immediate sanction of Provisional Family Pension to the Government servants, who died in harness.

9.Despite the Government Orders referred to above, the payments of the retiral benefits were time and again effected belatedly.

10.Such issue was considered by the Apex Court in a case reported in 2001 (9) SCC 687 (Vijay L.Mehrotra Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and others), wherein it has been observed as follows:-

"3.In case of an employee retiring after having rendered service, it is expected that all the payment of the retiral benefits should be paid on the date of retirement or soon thereafter if for some unforeseen circumstances the payments could not be made on the date of retirement.

4.In this case, there is absolutely no reason or justification for not making the payments for months together. We, therefore, direct the respondent to pay to the appellant within 12 weeks from today simple interest at the rate of 18 per cent with effect from the date of her retirement, ie., 31.08.1997 till the date of payments."

11.The Hon'ble Supreme Court in D.D.Tewari (Dead) through Legal Representatives v. Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd and others [(2014) 8 SCC 894], held that erroneous withholding of gratuity amount to which employee is legally entitled, entails penalty on delayed payment and that, denial of *interest from the date of entitlement till the date of payment of pension, has resulted in miscarriage of justice and hence, awarded interest at 9% on delayed payment, failing which, the same shall carry interest at 18% p.a.*

12.Following the aforesaid decision of the Supreme Court, the Division Bench of this Court in K.Rajendran and others v. the Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation (Madurai) Ltd and others [CDJ 2015 MHC 8204] rendered in WA.(MD) Nos.383 to 457 of 2015 on 12.06.2015, passed the following order:

"1.The learned Additional Advocate General submits that he has obtained written instructions vide letter No.7945/E/2015-2 dated 11/6/2015 that the terminal benefits of the appellants would be settled through twelve equal monthly installments, carrying interest of 6%p.a.

2.The said statement is thus taken on record and the respondents will be bound by the same. We have to keep in mind the judicial pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in D.D.Tewari (D) Thr.Lrs. Vs.Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam Ltd. & others (2014 (9) Scale -78), wherein, it is held that in case of any delay in making the payment of the installments, the interest payable would become 18% pa for the delayed period apart from any other remedy which may be available to the appellants for non-compliance of undertaking given to this Court."

13.Similar order was relied on and the same was passed by this Court in number of cases viz., (i)P.Subramanian v. The

Managing Director, Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation, Tirunelveli Ltd and another [CDJ 2016 MHC 5099]; (ii)R.Krishnaswamy v. K.Venkataramani [MANU/TN/0525/2017] rendered in WP.No.43618 of 2016 on 03.02.2017; (iii)T.Nagarajan and others v. the Managing Director, Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation (Tirunelveli) Ltd and others [CDJ 2017 MHC 1908], etc.

14.Citing the pendency of criminal cases and punishments etc., some of the petitioners were not granted the terminal benefits and ultimately the same was settled belatedly, but without interest. When such issue was taken into consideration by this Court in W.P.No.8707 of 2006, by order dated 12.03.2007 held as follows:-

"3.The grievance of the petitioner is that as a result of the illegal dismissal, he was not permitted to retire on 31.01.1967 itself and he has been permitted to retire only in the year 1992, as a result of which his terminal benefits due to him were paid belatedly. In view of the belated payments made to him, he has suffered loss and hence by way of representation to the Collector, Periyar District and to the Principal Commissioner and Commissioner for Revenue Administration, Madras-5, dated 03.02.1995 claimed interest on the terminal benefits belatedly paid to him. By an order, dated 08.09.1995, the District Collector, Periyar District stated that only in respect of Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity amount, interest would be paid and that necessary proposals have been sent to the Government and for the belated payment of all the other amounts, no interest would be paid, since there is no provision in

the Rules. Hence, the petitioner was constrained to file the said Original Application challenging the order referred to above.

......

8.As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the order of dismissal has been set aside by the Government in pursuance of G.O.(2D)No.123, Revenue Department, dated 18.11.1992. In that Government Order it has been specifically stated that there is no pecuniary loss to the Government. Further, it reads that the charges are not serious in nature, which warranting the dismissal from service. In view of the said specific stand taken by the Government, the petitioner is entitled to interest for the belated payment of terminal benefits. For the belated payment of terminal benefits, the petitioner cannot be blamed. Since the petitioner was facing departmental proceedings, terminal benefits have been with held by the Government. Now the order of dismissal has been set aside by an order, dated 18.11.1992 as referred to above, the petitioner will be entitled to interest for the belated payment of pension, commutation of pension etc. The impugned order dated 08.09.1995 is therefore, liable to be set aside and accordingly, set aside. The petitioner will be entitled to get interest at the rate of 10% per annum for the belated payment of Pension, Commutation of Pension, Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity, encashment of earned leave, General Provident Fund, Special Provident Fund and Pay fixation arrears."

15.Such view was affirmed by the Division Bench of this Court in W.A.No.886 of 2007, dated 17.12.2018 and the same reads *as follows:-*

"5.In Dr.Uma Agarwal Vs. State of U.P., reported in (1993)3 SCC 438, the Supreme Court held that,

"...... grant of pension is not a bounty but a right of the Government servant. The Government is obliged to follow the Rules mentioned in the earlier part of this order in letter and in spirit. Delay in settlement of retiral benefits is frustrating and must be avoided at all costs. Such delays are occurring even in regard to family pensions for which too there is a prescribed procedure. This is indeed unfortunate. In cases where a retired Government servant claims interest for delayed payment, the Court can certainly keep in mind the time-schedule prescribed in the Rules/Instructions apart from other relevant factors applicable to each case."

6.The contention of the appellant that as per the Government norms, interest can be paid only on Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity, in case of delay and the same cannot be awarded to any other retiral benefits, is not tenable, in view of the decision of the Supreme Court in S.K.Dua Vs. State of Haryana reported in 2008 (3) SCC 44. In the reported case, the appellant therein was served with three charge sheets/show cause notices in June 1998, few days before his retirement. However, he retired on 30.06.1998 on reaching the age of superannuation. He was paid provisional pension, but other retiral benefits were not given to him, which included commuted value of pension, leave encashment, gratuity, etc. They were withheld till the finalisation of disciplinary proceedings. While answering the issue as to whether the appellant therein was entitled to interest on delayed payment of retiral *benefits, in the absence of any statutory rules/administrative instructions or guidelines, the Supreme Court, at paragraph 14 of the Judgment, held as follows:-*

"14.In the circumstances, prima facie, we are of the view that the grievance voiced by the appellant appears to be well founded that he would be entitled to interest on such benefits. If there are statutory rules occupying the field, the appellant could claim payment of interest relying on such rules. If there are administrative instructions, guidelines or norms prescribed for the purpose, the appellant may claim benefit of interest on that basis. But even in the absence of statutory rules, administrative instructions or guidelines, an employee can claim interest under Part III of the Constitution relying on Articles 14, 19 and 21 of the Constitution. The submission of the learned counsel for the appellant, that retiral benefits, are not in the nature of "bounty", is, in our opinion, well founded and needs no authority in support thereof. In that view of the matter, in our considered opinion, the High Court was not right in dismissing the petition in limine even without issuing notice to the respondents."

16.The very same issue was again considered by this Court reported in 2010 (8) MLJ 254 (R.Ganesan and another Vs. Rane Luk Clutch (P) Limited and others).

17.Following the said order, this Court in a Writ Petition filed seeking retirement benefits with interest for the belated payment elaborately considered in the case reported in 2010 (7)

MLJ 577 (P.Nagarathna Pandian Vs. Managing Director and others).

18.Insofar as the cases in which the retiral benefits are denied on account of disciplinary proceedings and the delay in disposal of the same would entitle the employee to get interest on delayed payment, this Court, in various cases, particularly, in P.V.Mahadevan v. The Secretary to Government [2011(2) CWC 401], held that the departmental delay due to procedural lapses, etc., is untenable.

19.At this juncture, it is also useful to refer to Rule 45-A of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, which is re-produced hereunder:-

"45-A. Interest on delayed payment of gratuity.-

[(1) Interest at the rate of eight per cent per annum shall be payable on the death-cum-retirement gratuity paid beyond (a) period of two months from the date of retirement of a Government Servant:]

[Provided that on and from the 12th June, 1987, the rate of such interest shall be as follows:

(a) seven per cent per annum beyond a period of three months and upto one year; and

(b) ten per cent per annum beyond a period of one year:

Provided further that no such interest shall be payable,-

(a) where the institution of departmental or judicial proceeding against the retiring Government servant concerned is pending; and

(b) for the fraction of a month.]

[(1-A). The period beyond which such interest is payable shall be as follows.-

(i) in the case of a Government servant retired otherwise on superannuation and where the Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity is withheld on account of Disciplinary proceeding pending against him-

(a) three months from the date of retirement where the Government servant is exonerated of all charges and where the Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity is paid on the conclusion of disciplinary proceedings;

(b) three months from the date of death where the Disciplinary proceedings are dropped on account of death of a Government servant;

(c) three months from the date of issue of orders by the competent authority allowing payment of Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity where the Government servant is not fully exonerated on the conclusion of disciplinary proceedings and where the competent authority desires to allow payment of Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity.

(ii) six months from the date of retirement of a Government servant otherwise than on superannuation under Fundamental Rule 56(2), or 56(3), or Rules 33, 36, 38, 39 and 42 of the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978;

(iii) six months from the date of death of a Government servant while in service and where the delay is not caused on account of more than one claimant;

(iv) three months from the date of issue of orders revising the emoluments where the amount of Death-cum-Retirement Gratuity already paid is enhanced on account of revision of emoluments; and

(v) six months from the date of absorption in the case of permanent absorption in the Public Sector Undertakings or Autonomous bodies otherwise than on enmass transfer on conversion of Government department or a part thereo into Public Sector Undertakings or Autonomous bodies.]

[(2) The Government shall be the authority competent to sanction such interest.]"

20.Thus, the principles enunciated from the aforesaid decisions rendered by the Supreme Court as well as by this Court and also in the light of the Government Orders and the relevant provisions of law, are that the benefits bestowed by law upon an employee in recognition of his/her committed, continuous, loyal and devoted duty by payment of the pension, gratuity, leave salary etc., are in the nature of property and such right cannot be taken away without following due process of law; further, the grant of pension is not a bounty and the Government is obliged to follow the relevant Rules in that regard; Also that, the delay in settlement of retiral benefits and payment of pension is frustrating the employees and the same could have been compensated by way of interest."

9.Though the learned counsel for the appellants categorically contended that the aforesaid case is not applicable to the facts and circumstances of this case, we are of the considered view that the various cases referred in the aforesaid order especially the case of ***S.K.Dua v. State of Haryana*** reported in ***2008 (3) SCC 44*** and the case of ***T.Nagarajan and others v. the Managing Director, Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation (Tirunelveli) Limited and others*** reported in ***CDJ 2017 MHC 1908*** would be squarely applicable to the facts and circumstances of this case.

10.It is an accepted position of law that gratuity and pension are not bounties and an employee earns these benefits of his long and continuous service. Even in the instant case, the respondent had put in a long service of 29 years in the Department of the appellants. The right to receive pension by an employee has been very well described in ***D.S.Nakara and others v. Union of India*** by the Hon'ble Apex Court reported in ***(1983) 1 SCC 305*** and the relevant portion is extracted as follows:-

> *""The approach of the respondents raises a vital and none too easy of answer, question as to why pension is paid. And why was it required to be liberalised? Is the employer, which expression will include even the State, bound to pay pension? Is there any obligation on the employer to provide for the erstwhile employee even after the contract of employment has come to an end and the employee has*

ceased to render service?

-

What is a pension? What are the goals of pension? What public interest or purpose, if any, it seeks to serve? If it does seek to serve some public purpose, is it thwarted by such artificial division of retirement pre and post a certain date? We need seek answer to these and incidental questions so as to render just justice between parties to this petition.

The antiquated notion of pension being a bounty a gratituous payment depending upon the sweet will or grace of the employer not claimable as a right and, therefore, no right to pension can be enforced through Court has been swept under the carpet by the decision of the Constitution Bench in Deoki Nandan Prasad v. State of Bihar and Ors.[1971] Su. S.C.R. 634 wherein this Court authoritatively ruled that pension is a right and the payment of it does not depend upon the discretion of the Government but is governed by the rules and a Government servant coming within those rules is entitled to claim pension. It was further held that the grant of pension does not depend upon any one's discretion. It is only for the purpose of quantifying the amount having regard to o service and other allied maters that it may be necessary for the authority to pass an order to that effect but the right to receive pension flows to the officer not because of any such order but by virtue of the rules. This view was reaffirmed in State of Punjab and Anr. V. Iqbal Singh (1976) IILLJ 377SC"."

11.In view of the mandate of the aforesaid judgment extracted supra, it is needless to state that pension is thus the hard-earned benefit, which accrues on an employee and the same is in the nature of property and hence, right to property cannot be taken away without due process of law as per the provisions of Article 300A of the Constitution of India. Having understood that the right to receive pension flows to an employee by the virtue of Rules, it has become necessary for us to discuss the Rules relating to the release of pension. The present case is governed by the Tamil Nadu Pension Rules, 1978. Rule 9 of the said Pension Rules confers power on the State Government to withhold or withdraw pension or part thereof under certain circumstances. This Rule 9 reads as under:-

"Right of [Competent Authority] to withhold or withdrew pension:-

[(1)(a) The [Competent Authority] reserve to themselves the right of withholding or withdrawing a pension or part thereof, whether permanently or for a specified period if, in any departmental or judicial proceeding, the pensioner is found guilty of grave misconduct or negligence during the period of his service, including service rendered upon re-employment after retirement, and such withholding or withdrawing the pension may be effected irrespective of the fact whether or not any pecuniary loss on account of such grave misconduct or negligence was caused to the

Government, to any local body or to any co-operative society comprising of government servants and registered under the Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1961;

[Provided that before passing an order under this clause, if the pensioner does not agree to such withholding or withdrawal of the pension, the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission shall be consulted by the Government. In respect of pensioners who belonged to service other than the State Service, the Head of the Department concerned shall refer the case to the Government and the Government, after consulting the Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission shall intimate the views of the Commission to the Head of the Department concerned for issue of final orders. The Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission need not be consulted in cases where the pensioner agrees to withholding or withdrawal of the pension, but a copy of the orders passed by the competent authority in such cases shall be sent to the said Commission.]

Provided further that where a part of pension is withheld or withdrawn, the amount of such pension shall not be reduced below the limit specified in subrule (5) of Rule 43.

(2) (a) The departmental proceeding referred rule to in sub-(1), if instituted while the Government servant was in service, whether before his retirement during his re- or employment shall, after the final retirement of the Government servant be deemed to be proceedings under this rule and shall be continued and concluded by the authority by which they were commenced in the same manner as if the Government servant had continued in service:

[Provided that where the departmental proceedings are instituted by an authority subordinate an Government, that authority shall submit a report recording its findings to the Government in case of pensioners who belonged to the State Service] The departmental proceedings, if not instituted while the Government servant was in service, whether before his retirement or during his reemployment,-

(i) shall not be instituted save with the sanction of the Government [in respect of pensioners who belonged to State Service]

(ii) shall not be in respect of any event which took place more than four years before such institution; and

(iii) shall be conducted by such authority and in such place as the Government may direct and in accordance with the procedure applicable to departmental proceedings in which an order of dismissal from service could be made in relation to the Government servant during his service."

12.From the reading of the aforesaid Rule 9(1)(a), the following position emerges -

(I)The State Government has the power to withhold or withdraw pension or any part of it when the employee is found to be guilty of grave misconduct either in a Departmental proceeding or Judicial proceeding.

(II)This provision does not empower the State to invoke the said power if the judicial proceeding has not been concluded on the date of superannuation.

(III)Only if the employee is convicted/found guilty of misconduct either in department or judicial proceedings, the State is empowered to invoke the said power.

(IV)As far as the pending departmental proceedings on the date of superannuation of an employee is concerned, in that case, the Government Servant shall be deemed to be under the proceedings under this Rule, which shall be continued and concluded by the authority, as if they were commenced in the same manner, as if the Government Servant had continued in service.

13.Hence, the position has evolved clear that the power of withholding pensionary benefits can be invoked by the State only when the judicial proceedings initiated against the employee has been concluded finding guilty and not before. As far as the instant case is concerned, the appellants have not initiated any departmental proceedings as against the respondent.

14.Therefore, we do not find any infirmity in the impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge and we have no hesitation to hold that the pension granted to a public servant on him attaining the age of superannuation and on his retirement is property within the meaning of Article 300A of the Constitution of India and he could be deprived of the same only by Authority of Law. That apart, we are of the considered view that pension does not cease to be property on the mere denial or cancellation of it, for that reason that the character of pension as 'property' cannot possibly undergo such mutation at the whim of a particular authority.

15.Accordingly, the Writ Appeal stands dismissed and the appellants are directed to comply with the directions of the learned Single Judge in W.P.(MD)No.17411 of 2015 dated 05.03.2019, within eight weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this judgment. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, miscellaneous petition is closed.

(N.S.S., J.)   (L.V.G., J.)
11.06.2024

Index : Yes / No
Neutral Citation : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
Mrn

To

1.The District Collector,
Theni District,
Theni.

2.The District Revenue Officer,
O/o. the District Revenue Officer,
Theni District.

3.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Periyakulam,
Theni District.

4.The Tahsildar,
Periyakulam Taluk,
Theni District.

N.SESHASAYEE, J.
and
L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

MRN

Judgment MADE IN
W.A(MD)No.747 of 2019
and CMP(MD)No.6572 of 2019

11.06.2024