



WEB COPY



W.A.No.389 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.02.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. M. SUBRAMANIAM

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

Writ Appeal No.389 of 2025

and

Civil Miscellaneous Petition No.3178 of 2025

1. K.Saravanan
2. P.Theeththu
3. K.Thilagam
4. C.Anandhan
5. V.Prabhu
6. P.Sathik Basha
7. M.Abdul Kaium
8. G.Raguraman
9. G.Amutha
10. V.Venkatesan
11. R.Karunanithi
12. P.Nagaraj
13. A.Stalin
14. D.Archana
15. N.Santhosh
16. K.Sarveshkumar
17. G.Gopikannan
18. P.Thamilarasan
19. M.Shanmugam
20. M.Santhi
21. S.Yaraf
22. A.Rathinam



W.A.No.389 of 2025

23. E.Kanjana
24. T.Saravanan
25. C.Ramachandra
26. S.Srinivasan

... Appellants

Vs.

1. The Commissioner of Municipal Administration,
Department of Municipal Administration,
Ezhilagam, Chepauk,
Chennai – 600 052.
2. The Director of Town Panchayat,
Kuralagam, Chennai – 28.
3. The Assistant Director of Town Panchayats,
Dharmapuri Division, Dharmapuri District.
4. The Executive Officer,
Harur Town Panchayat,
Harur Post and Taluk,
Dharmapuri District – 636 903.

... Respondents

Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letters Patent Act, against
the order dated 10.01.2025 in W.P.No.755 of 2025.

For Appellants : Mr.C.Prakasam

For Respondents : Mr.C.Selvaraj
Additional Government Pleader



W.A.No.389 of 2025

JUDGMENT

WEB COPY

(Judgment of the Court was made by S.M.SUBRAMANIAM,J.)

Under assail is the order dated 10.01.2025 passed in W.P.No.755 of 2025.

2. The writ petitioners are the appellants before this Court. The appellants, shop holders were having commercial shops in the bus stand area of Harur Town Panchayat. Allotment was made to them in the year 2017. They were running petty shops, barber shops, tea shop and petty beeda shops. They were all directed to vacate the premises since the bus stand was to be demolished and reconstructed as per the policy decision taken by the third respondent.

3. Mr.C.Prakasam, learned counsel for the appellants would submit that the existing allottees must be given priority since they have deposited money. The lease period has not expired and therefore, the appellants must be granted allotment in the new shops.

4. Once a policy decision has been taken by the third respondent to demolish the bus stand and to re-construct the same, the existing lease



W.A.No.389 of 2025

would not be of any avail to the appellants to secure new shops, which is to be allotted by following the procedures as contemplated.

5. The learned Single Judge has granted liberty to the appellants to participate in the auction process. Allotment of a shop in a bus stand is not an absolute right however, the appellants were granted liberty to participate in the auction process. Regarding the other claims relating to security deposit, the writ Court granted liberty to the appellants to submit a separate application to settle the claims.

6. Thus, this Court do not find any infirmity in respect of the writ order, which is under challenge in the present intra court appeal. Consequently, the writ appeal stands dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is also stands dismissed.

(S.M.S., J.)

(K.R.S., J.)

13.02.2025

ssi

Index: Yes/No

Speaking Order: Yes/No

Neutral Citation Case : Yes/No



W.A.No.389 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The Commissioner of Municipal Administration,
Department of Municipal Administration,
Ezhilagam, Chepauk,
Chennai – 600 052.
2. The Director of Town Panchayat,
Kuralagam, Chennai – 28.
3. The Assistant Director of Town Panchayats,
Dharmapuri Division, Dharmapuri District.
4. The Executive Officer,
Harur Town Panchayat,
Harur Post and Taluk,
Dharmapuri District – 636 903.



WEB COPY



W.A.No.389 of 2025

S.M.SUBRAMANIAM., J.

AND

K. RAJASEKAR., J.

ssi

W.A.No.389 of 2025
and
C.M.P.No.3178 of 2025

13.02.2025