



WEB COPY

WP No. 21208 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-06-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE N. ANAND VENKATESH

WP No. 21208 of 2025

AND

WMP NOs. 23954 and 23956 OF 2025

1. PVR Inox Limited

Rep By Its Authorised Signatory

Mr.Ayyapan K, Having Registered

Office At Building No.9a, 4th Floor,

DLF Cyber City, Phase- III, Gurgaon,

Haryana- 122002 Also At 25,

Mamatha Complex, 5th Floor, Whites

Road, Royapettah, Chennai-14, Tamil

Nadu.

2.Y.Jayant Kaushik

S/o.Kesaulu Naidu, Aged 43 Y, Zonal

Head- Chennai PVR Inox Limited

Having Office At 25, Mamatha

Complex, 5th Floor, Whites Road,

Royapettah, Chennai- 14, Tamil Nadu.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Airport Authority Of India

Having Its Principal Office at Rajiv

Gandhi Bhawan, Safdarjung Airport,



New Delhi, Delhi-110 003.

2.Meenambakkam Realty Private

Limited Having office at

No.617, New No.418, Bharat Kumar

Bhavan, Anna Salai, Chennai 600 006

Olympia Techpark Chennai Private

Limited 1, Sidco Industrial Estate,

Guindy, Chennai-32.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

Writ petition filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India for the issuance of writ of Mandamus to direct the Respondent No.1 to favourably consider the representation dated 29 May 2025 issued by the petitioner No.1 requesting the Respondent No.1 to permit Petitioner No.1 to continue its operations in the MLCP Complex and pass orders.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.P.S.Raman
Senior Counsel for
Arva Merchant

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.R.L.Sundaresan
Additional Solicitor General of
India Assisted by
Mr.Ramaswamy Meyyappan,
learned counsel

ORDER

This writ petition has been filed for the issue of writ of Mandamus directing the 1st respondent to consider the representation made by the petitioner



on 29.05.2025 requesting the 1st respondent to permit the petitioner to continue its operations in the MLCP complex.

WEB COPY

2. Heard Mr.P.S.Raman, learned Senior Counsel for Arva Merchant and Mr.A.R.L.Sundaresan, learned Additional Solicitor General of India Assisted by Mr.Ramaswamy Meyyappan, learned counsel for respondents 1 and 2.

3. The petitioner is a sub-licensee under Meenambakam Realty Private Limited. The petitioner is running a MLCP complex and the license has been issued to the petitioner.

4. The 1st respondent issued a letter to the 2nd respondent directing the 2nd respondent to close the cinema operations on the ground that there is a statutory bar under the Airport Authority of India Act. On receipt of the same, the 2nd respondent filed an application before the Delhi High Court under Section 9 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 seeking for an urgent injunctive relief and subsequently, invoked the Arbitration Clause under the Development Agreement.

5. Initially, an order of status quo was granted by the Delhi High Court and in the meantime, the Arbitral Tribunal was constituted and pursuant to the same, Section 9 application was converted to Section 17 application



before the Arbitral Tribunal. On 07.02.2024, the Arbitral Tribunal passed an order granting interim protection and stayed the impugned letter issued by the 1st respondent dated 21.07.2023.

6. As a subsequent development, the 2nd respondent informed the petitioner that the development agreement has been terminated. Pursuant to the same, the interim order that was granted was vacated by an order dated 09.06.2025. Under such circumstances, since the petitioner was not clear about their status in continuing with the operations in the MLCP complex, they made a representation before the 1st respondent on 29.05.2025. Since the same was not considered, the present writ petition has been filed before this Court.

7. To a pointed question that was put to the learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner as to how the petitioner can continue with the operation after the cancellation of the agreement with the 2nd respondent, the learned Senior Counsel pointed out to Article 42.1 and 42.2 of the Development Agreement and submitted that inspite of such termination of agreement, the authority has the discretion to allow the sub-licencee to continue with the operation on mutually negotiable terms and conditions. The learned Senior counsel submitted that the representation was made to the 1st respondent requesting for exercising such discretion and to permit the petitioner to continue with the operation.



8. The learned Additional Solicitor General appearing on behalf of the 1st respondent submitted that the petitioner does not have the legal right to insist for the continuation of the operation and it is left to the discretion of the authority even as per the agreement. The learned Additional Solicitor General further submitted that the representation of the petitioner is pending before the 1st respondent and that a decision will be taken very shortly.

9. Considering the scope of the present writ petition and taking note of the fact that the request made by the petitioner is now pending before the 1st respondent, it will suffice to direct the 1st respondent to take a decision and inform the petitioner in line with the development agreement dated 20.06.2018 and in accordance with law. Till then, the present status quo shall be maintained.

10. This writ petition is disposed of in the above terms. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

16-06-2025

rka

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WEB COPY

WP No. 21208 of 2025





WP No. 21208 of 2025



WEB COPY

1. Airport Authority Of India
Having Its Head Office at. Rajiv
Gandhi Bhawan, Safdarjung Airport,
New Delhi, Delhi-110 003.

2. Meenambakkam Realty Private
Limited
Olympia Techpark Chennai Private
Limited 1, Sidco Industrial Estate,
Guindy, Chennai-32.



WEB COPY

WP No. 21208 of 2025



N.ANAND VENKATESH J.
rka

WP No. 21208 of 2025
WMP NOs. 23954 and
23956 OF 2025

16-06-2025