



W.P.(MD).Nos.23898 to 23905 of 2017

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 14.02.2024

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **B.PUGALENDHI**

W.P.(MD).Nos.23898 to 23905 of 2017

and

W.M.P(MD).Nos.20044, 20046, 20048, 20050, 20052, 20054, 20056 and
20058 of 2017

Alaguraj

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Managing Director,
Arasu Cable TV Corporation Ltd.m
34/123, 6th Floor,
Dukar Tower,
Marsal Salai,
Chennai-600 008.

2.The Special Tahsildar,
Tamil Nadu Cable TV Corporation Ltd.,
Pudukkottai District.

... Respondents

PRAYER : Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Certiorari, calling for the records relating to the impugned demand notice in proceedings No.007461/13750/2017/66 dated 21.06.2017 passed by the first respondent and quash the same.



W.P.(MD).Nos.23898 to 23905 of 2017

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Prasanna Vinoth
For Respondents : M/s.S.Devasena
Standing Counsel

COMMON ORDER

All the petitioners are LCOs registered with Tamil Nadu Arasu Cable TV Corporation and they have filed these writ petitions challenging the demand notice issued by the first respondent dated 21.06.2017.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the respondent/Arasu Cable TV Corporation have not provided any signals to the petitioners. However, they have issued a demand notice. According to them, they were receiving signals from one Marakkayar, who is also another LCO. The said Marakkayar's premises was closed down by the respondents and therefore, signals were not provided to the petitioners. Without providing signals, the first respondent has issued the demand notice against the petitioners.



W.P.(MD).Nos.23898 to 23905 of 2017

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the petitioners submitted a representation on 20.06.2017, one day prior to the demand notice stating that they were not receiving any signals from the respondents. However, without considering the same, the first respondent has issued the impugned notice.

4. The learned counsel for the respondents submits that admittedly all the petitioners are registered as LCOs with the Tamil Nadu Arasu Cable TV Corporation and they were receiving signals from the Arasu Cable TV Corporation. He further submits that the petitioners have to settle their dues and this impugned notice was issued after deducting the amount, which have already been paid.

5. Admittedly all the petitioners are LCOs. One day prior to the impugned notice, the petitioners have submitted a representation that they have not received any signals from the Tamil Nadu Arasu Cable TV Corporation. The petitioners have already paid a part of the amount for receiving the signals from the Arasu Cable TV Corporation and the present impugned notices were issued demanding the balance amount.



W.P.(MD).Nos.23898 to 23905 of 2017

WEB COPY

6. In view of the same, this Court is not inclined to allow these writ petitions. Therefore, these writ petitions are dismissed with liberty to the petitioners to submit their explanation if any by way of fresh representation within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt a copy of this order. On receipt of such representation given by the petitioners, the respondent corporation shall take further course of action. No Costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

14.02.2024

Index: Yes/No
Internet: Yes/No
tta

To

- 1.The Managing Director,
Arasu Cable TV Corporation Ltd.m
34/123, 6th Floor,
Dukar Tower,
Marsal Salai,
Chennai-600 008.
- 2.The Special Tahsildar,
Tamil Nadu Cable TV Corporation Ltd.,
Pudukkottai District.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD).Nos.23898 to 23905 of 2017

B.PUGALENDHI, J.

tta

W.P.(MD).Nos.23898 to 23905 of 2017

14.02.2024