WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.06.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

W.P.Nos.16024 & 16027 of 2025
and WMP Nos.18127 & 18133 of 2025

WP.No.16024 of 2025

Mr.S.Nambirajan
Proprietor, Friends Satellite Vision (Reg.No.332)
Local Cable Operator (LCO)
1/1, Tank Bund Road, Nandanam
Chennai 600 035. .. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Managing Director
Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Head Office, CMDA Complex
Koyambedu, Chennai 600 107.

2.The Chief Revenue Officer
Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Head Office, CMDA Complex Koyambedu
Chennai 600 107.

3.Executive Engineer and Administrative Officer
C.I.T.Nagar Division, Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Nandanam, Chenni 600 035. .. Respondents
in W.P.No.16024 of 2025

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, directing the respondents for calling of records in letter No.CIT/04/582/2007 dated 07.03.2025 and quash the same and consequently direct the 3rd respondent to grant permission to the petitioner to operate cable television operation in Scheme II flats consisting of 1387 flats in the Todhunter Nagar scheme area.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

W.P.No.16027 of 2025

Mr.S.Nambirajan
Proprietor, Friends Satellite Vision (Reg.No.332)
Local Cable Operator (LCO) 1/1,
Tank Bund Road, Nandanam, Chennai 600 035. .. Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Managing Director
Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Head Office, CMDA Complex
Koyambedu, Chennai 600 107.

2.The Chief Revenue Officer
Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Head Office, CMDA Complex Koyambedu
Chennai 600 107.

3.Executive Engineer and Administrative Officer
C.I.T.Nagar Division, Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Nandanam, Chenni 600 035.

4.A.Anthony .. Respondents

Prayer : Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the 3rd respondent in letter No.CIT/85/2025 dated 12.02.2025, issued to in favour of 4th respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents to grant permission to the petitioner for running the cable television.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Chandrasekaran

For Respondents : Mr.Veerasekaran for TNHB for R1 to R3

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

COMMON ORDER

The issue involved in both these writ petitions are inter connected and hence both the writ petitions are taken up together, heard and disposed of through this common order.

2.The petitioner has challenged the impugned communication dated 07.03.2025, issued by the 3rd respondent and sought for permission to operate cable television operation in Scheme II flats also consisting of 1387 flats in WP.No.16024 of 2025.

3.The petitioner has also questiioned the permission granted by the 3rd respondent to the 4th respondent to operate cable television operation in Scheme II flats consisting of 1387 flats.

4.Initially, there were 686 flats constructed by the Housing Board which was allotted to Government servants. The petitioner was permitted to run the cable TV operation on payment of monthly rent. Thereafter, the building was in a dilapidated condition and hence, the Government ordered for demolition of the flats and for construction of a new building.

5.The petitioner wanted to continue with the cable connection for the entire tenements and whereas the 3rd respondent through communication dated 07.03.2025

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

informed the petitioner that he can continue to operate cable television operation for 504 flats. Insofar as 1387 flats available in Scheme II, the petitioner was not given the permission and it was given in favour of one Anthony, who is the 4th respondent in WP.No.16027 of 2025. It is under these circumstances, the present writ petition came to be filed before this Court.

6.Heard Mr.K.Chandrasekaran, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr.D.Veerasekaran, learned counsel (TNHB) for R1 to R3.

7.In the considered view of this Court, the petitioner does not have any legal right to operate cable TV connection in all the flats belonging to the Housing Board. In other words, the petitioner cannot be permitted to monopolize without giving opportunity to others. It is under these circumstances, the petitioner was granted permission for 504 flats and the said Anthony was given permission for 1037 flats in Phase-II. These are matters which falls within prerogative of the 3rd respondent who has granted permission as per the Board norms. This Court exercising its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot interfere into such commercial decisions taken by the Housing Board. Hence, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned proceedings that have been put to challenge in both the writ petitons. Before concluding, this Court wants to direct the Housing Board to call for a tender in future while granting permission to operate cable TV connections, so that the Housing

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Board can maximize their revenue in terms of monthly rent. This will also avoid any arbitrariness in granting permission to anyone who makes an application. Such an observation is made since in WP.No.16027 of 2025, the permission has been given to the 4th respondent only based on the request made by him.

8.In the result, both the writ petitions are disposed of in the above terms. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

19.06.2025

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
kp

To

1.The Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Head Office, CMDA Complex
Koyambedu
Chennai 600 107.

2.The Chief Revenue Officer
Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Head Office, CMDA Complex Koyambedu
Chennai 600 107.

3.Executive Engineer and Administrative Officer
C.I.T.Nagar Division, Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Nandanam, Chenni 600 035.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

N. ANAND VENKATESH, J.

kp

W.P.Nos.16024 & 16027 of 2025

19.06.2025

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis