



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

WEB COPY

DATED : 01.04.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

K.S.Mani Electricals
Represented by its Proprietor
Mr.K.Subramanian
Having Business at No.50, III Cross
Velmurugan Nagar
Kuyavarpalayam, Puducherry 13. ... Petitioner in W.P.No.24664/2023

G.Kuppusamy & Co,
Represented by its Proprietor
Mr.J.Vinyagamurthy
Having Business at No.50, III Cross
Velmurugan Nagar
Kuyavarpalayam, Puducherry 13. ... Petitioner in W.P.No.24666/2023

Vs.

1.The Union of India
Rep.by the Chief Secretary
Government of Pondicherry
Pondicherry.



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

WEB COPY 2. The Secretary

Department of Finance
Government of Pondicherry
Public Works Department
Puducherry 605 005.

3. The Secretary

Adi Dravidar Welfare Department
Government of Pondicherry
Pondicherry.

4. The Director

Adi Dravidar Welfare Department
Government of Pondicherry
Pondicherry.

5. The Managing Director

Pondicherry Adi Dravidar Development
Corporation (PADCO), No.30, II Cross
Pon Nagar, Rediyarpalayam, Pondicherry.

6. D. Ragunathan

Officer on Special Duty
Police Department (Retired)
No.9, Sai Street, 9th Cross, Krishna
Nagar, Puducherry.8

...Respondents in both W.P.Nos.

**(R6-impleaded as per order dated 01.04.2025
in WMP.Nos.7614 & 7630/2024 in
W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666/2023)**



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

Common Prayer : Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution

of India, to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records relating to the order passed in No.1215/PADSTDC/EW/2023-24 dated 10.07.2023 by the fifth respondent and to quash the same and consequently direct the respondents herein to release the funds to the petitioner based on the reports submitted by the Advocate Commissioners under the Civic and Basic Amenities Funds towards the installation of High Mast Lightening System and availing External Service Connection at various places in Pondicherry and Karaikal Region and further in changing of the 400W High Mast Light into LED light fittings at various places in Pondicherry and Karaikal Region.

For Petitioners in
both W.P.Nos.

: Mr.P.V.Balasubramanian
Senior Counsel
Assisted by
Mr.M.Nandhakumar

For Respondents
in both W.P.Nos.

: Mr.R.Sreedhar for R1 to R5
Additional Government Pleader
(Pondicherry)
No appearance for R6



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

COMMON ORDER

These Writ Petitions are identical and pertain to similar causes of action; therefore, they are taken up together and disposed of by this common order.

2. The prayer in the Writ Petitions challenges the impugned orders issued to each of the petitioners on 10.07.2023. By this order, the petitioners' representation for payment of amounts due to them for the installation of High Mast Lights/Mini Mast Lights, including the foundations for the light towers and the associated foundation work, was denied.

3. The brief factual matrix in which these writ petitions arise is that the petitioners are firms engaged in electrical contracting and related works. They are also registered Class-I contractors with the Public Works Department of the Government of Union Territory of Puducherry. The petitioners assert that the fifth respondent corporation has been undertaking the installation of High Mast Lights/Mini Mast Lights in areas where people



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

from the Scheduled Caste community reside, aiming to enhance their safety and security.

4. The projects have been organised constituency-wise.

Whenever the fifth respondent corporation identifies a project, they will immediately issue a proceeding outlining the name of the work and the approximate amount involved. Thereafter, the Assistant Engineer of the fifth respondent corporation will identify the locations where the High Mast Lights or Mini Mast Lights need to be erected. The works were carried out by the petitioners according to the provided directions and specifications. Earlier, several amounts were also disbursed for the same works. However, when the petitioners completed the works in the year 2017-18, none of the payments were released. In fact, since not even a part of the amount was released, the petitioners could not manage to complete all the works; some of the High Mast and Mini Mast installations remain incomplete, few are in the foundation stage, and some were not undertaken at all. Nonetheless, they have performed the major portion of the work. In total, the petitioner in W.P.No.24664 of 2023, namely M/s.K.S.Mani Electricals, claims an



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

outstanding balance of Rs.7,43,87,000/-. As for the petitioner in WP.No.24666 of 2023, namely M/s.Kuppusamy and Co, they have completed works amounting to Rs.9,70,49,000/- for the Pondicherry Region and Rs.5,76,80,000/-for the Karaikal Region. Not a single rupee has been paid. Consequently, the petitioners previously approached this Court through W.P.Nos.32054 of 2019, etc.

5. In the aforementioned writ petitions, orders were issued appointing Advocate Commissioners on 29.06.2022 to conduct a detailed inspection and to file reports accordingly. Two Advocate Commissioners were appointed, one for the Puducherry Region and another for the Karaikal Region. The relevant order is extracted below for convenient reference;

“There is a serious dispute regarding the quantum of work completed and value thereof. While the report filed by the Engineers of the Pondicherry Electricity Department discloses that most of the high raise masts have not been completed, the petitioner has filed an independent report which discloses that majority of work has been completed.



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

2. In order resolve the dispute, with the consent of the learned counsel on either side, Mr.D.Sowndararajan, Advocate, Pondicherry and Mr.Senthil Ragavan, Advocate, Karaikal are appointed as Commissioners to inspect the masts in Pondicherry region and Karaikal region and file a report. The Advocate Commissioners are required to take the assistance of an expert preferably a person who had held a senior position in the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board or its successor corporation. The Commissioners are required to file a report indicating the extent of the work completed and the estimated value thereof. The inputs of the expert may also be incorporated in the report of the Commissioners.

3. The Registry is required to handover the Warrants of Commission to Mr.V.Balamurugan, Government Pleader, Pondicherry, who shall forward it to the Commissioners. The Warrants shall be issued by 06.07.2022. The Commissioners are requested to file their reports preferably by 8th August 2022. The initial remuneration to the Commissioners is fixed at Rs.50,000/- each and the same shall be shared equally by the petitioners and the Government of Pondicherry.”



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

6. Accordingly, the Advocate Commissioners inspected all the

WEB COPY

locations and provided detailed reports by the constituency. The learned Commissioner, *Mr.D.Soundararajan*, has submitted a comprehensive report consisting of parts A to G, spanning 47 pages. The Commissioner undertook the task of inspecting each High Mast Light and Mini Mast Light in the presence of the representatives of the petitioners, experts for valuation, and officials of the respondents. Accordingly, constituency-wise details are included in the Commissioner's report, detailing how many locations were identified, out of which in how many locations the erection is complete and the unit is working, how many remained incomplete, and in which locations the work had not started at all etc. Thereafter, concerning both the completed and incomplete locations, as per the prevailing schedule rates, the Commissioner, with the assistance of the expert, also assessed the work undertaken by the petitioners. The final estimated value and work status are presented in a tabular format regarding M/s. G. Kuppusamy and Co. in Part E, and M/s. K. S. Mani Electricals in Part F, which are provided below for reference:



Part -E

The Works Status and my estimated value for the works done by the Writ Petitioner (S.Kuppusamy & Co, Rep.by its Proprietor: J.Vinayagamurthy) in W.P.No.32056 of 2019 for the following constituencies [as per Part-B] are as follows:

<i>Sl.No.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Estimated Value</i>	<i>Work Status</i>
1	Lawspet	Rs.1,65,07,883/-	Major works completed
2	Muthialpet	Rs.13,54,649/-	Totally Incomplete
3	Nellithope	Rs.50,37,070/-	Totally Incomplete
4	Ariyankuppam	Rs.12,37,643/-	Mostly Incomplete
5	Manaveli	Rs.1,61,16,669/-	Not fully completed
6	Abishekapakkam	Rs.16,16,140/-	Fully completed
7	Villianur	Rs.77,11,024/-	Totally incomplete
8	Embalam	Rs.26,87,200/-	Fully completed
9	Raj Bahavan	Rs.1,82,735/-	Totally incomplete
	Total Estimation	Rs.5,24,51,013/-	(Rupees Five Crores Twenty Four Lakhs Fifty One Thousand and Thirteen Only)



WEB COPY

Part -F

The Works Status and my estimated value for the works done by the Writ Petitioner [K.S.Mani Electrical, Rep by its Proprietor: K.Subramanian] in W.P.No.32054 of 2019 for the following constituencies [as per Part-C] are as follows:

<i>Sl.No.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Estimated Value</i>	<i>Work Status</i>
1	Bahour High Mast	Rs.1,42,00,593/-	Not fully completed
2	Bahour Mini Mast	Rs.63,11,540/-	Not fully completed
3	Ossudu	Rs.48,52,043/-	Incomplete
4	Embalam	Rs.17,68,310/-	Fully Completed
5	Kamaraj Nagar	Rs.1,02,93,471/--	Not fully completed
6	Raj Bhavan	Rs.70,33,424/-	Fully completed
	Total Estimation	Rs.4,44,59,381/-	(Rupees Four Crores Forty Four Lakhs Fifty Nine Three Hundred and Eighty One Only)



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

7. Similarly, regarding the Karaikal Region, the learned

Commissioner *Mr.J.Senthil Raghavan* conducted a comparable exercise by constituency, where various locations were inspected. Finally, the work status performed by K.S.Mani Electricals and its valuation are detailed in Part-E, while information regarding G.Kuuppusamy and Co., is provided in Part-F, which is extracted below for easy reference;

Part -E

The Works Status and my estimated value for the works done by the Writ Petitioner [K.S.Mani Electrical, Rep by its Proprietor: K.Subramanian] in W.P.No.32054 of 2019 for the following constituencies [as per Part-B] are as follows:

<i>Sl.No.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Estimated Value</i>	<i>Work Status</i>
1	Thirunallar High Mast & T.R. Mini Pattinam Mast.	Rs.70,18,114/- [Rupees Seventy Lakhs Eighteen Thousand One Hundred and Fourteen Only]	Not fully completed



Part -F

The Works Status and my estimated value for the works done by the Writ Petitioner [S.Kuppusamy & Co, Rep by its Proprietor: J.Vinayagamurthy] in W.P.No.32056 of 2019 for the following constituencies [as per Part-C] are as follows:

<i>Sl.No.</i>	<i>Constituency</i>	<i>Estimated Value</i>	<i>Work Status</i>
1	Thirunallar High Mast	Rs.1,35,07,993/-	Not fully completed
2	TR Pattinam High Mast	Rs.4,17,680/-	Totally incomplete
3	Karaikal South	Rs.7,53,234/-	Totally incomplete
	Total Estimation	Rs.1,46,78,907/-	[Rupees One Crore Forty Six Lakhs Seventy Eight Thousand Nine Hundred and Seven One only]

8. Subsequently, the Court heard the matters and issued the following order, which is extracted below:

“ 8. It is seen from the earlier proceedings of this Court that Advocate Commissioners have been appointed to inspect the masts in Pondicherry Region and Karaikal



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

Region and they have been directed to file a report. Further, on a bare perusal of records, it reveals, while seeking for payments for the said erection, the petitioners have not enclosed the work orders issued in their favour. It is true that an expenditure/payments can be done from the ex-chequer only based on proper approval. That being the position, only after proper enquiry, the issue can be resolved. Further, petitioners have to submit proper records before the respondents for getting their payments and if they are entitled, the respondents shall act further for processing their payments.

9. However, considering the limited request made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, without going into the merits of the matter, this Court directs the petitioners herein to submit fresh representation in the above regard along with necessary enclosures to the fifth respondent, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. On receipt of such representations, the 5th respondent shall conduct an enquiry with regard to installation of High Mast Lights in Pondicherry region and Karaikal Region, claimed to have been erected by the petitioners herein and pass appropriate orders on merits and in accordance with law, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners or any other interested parties, within a period of twelve weeks thereafter.”




W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

WEB COPY

9. According to the aforementioned order, the respondents examined the issue and determined that there was not even a tender, no work order existed, and there was absolutely no sanctioned expenditure from the Government. Therefore, they rejected the entire claim made by the petitioners, leading to the issuance of the impugned orders, which prompted the filing of the present Writ Petitions.

10. Heard *Mr.P.V.Balasubramanian*, the learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners and *Mr.R.Sreedhar*, the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 5.

11. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners taking this Court through the initial order dated 05.09.2017, submitted that the petitioners are not privy to the intra-office and inter-departmental communications. Whether the Managing Director of PADCO received expenditure authorisation from the Government and whether there was




W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

budgetary sanction for the same cannot be considerations for the petitioners.

WEB COPY They were the approved contractors and were periodically directed to install the High Mast Lights/Mini Mast Lights at various locations identified by the officials of the fifth respondent; accordingly, they have completed the work and the lights are functioning. Earlier, when the carried out the works payments were released but for the current transactions, the payments were not made, resulting in these Writ Petitions.

12. The learned counsel submits that, regarding the matter, the concerned Managing Director has received a charge memorandum based on allegations that he awarded the contract without proper expenditure, thus causing a loss to the Government. Therefore, the Government can only claim this loss from him. To date, the Government has not paid a single rupee. The learned senior counsel further submits that, although the petitioners have claimed the amount per the original work order and estimate, the Advocate Commissioners have inspected and assessed the amount based on the scheduled rates in the presence of a retired Engineer from the Tamil Nadu Electricity Board who served as an expert. Given that the value has been



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023


established, the petitioners should at least be awarded the amount determined

by the Advocate Commissioner.

13. The learned senior counsel submits that the lights have been installed and are functioning in many locations. Additionally, the electricity connections have been provided, and the commissioners have found that the lights are operational in the majority of these locations. In the remaining locations, work could not be fully completed because no funds were released, and beyond a certain point, the petitioners could not invest their own money to finish the project. Even without authorization of expenditure, the respondents having received the benefits according to the principles of quantum meruit and under Section 70 of the Indian Contract Act, the respondents are obligated to release the payment.

14. The learned counsel would rely on the judgment of the Honourable Supreme Court of India in *Food Corporation of India and others Vs. Vikas Majdoor Kamdar Sahkari Mandli Limited*¹, specifically

¹(2007) 13 SCC 544




W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

referencing paragraphs 19 and 20 of the said judgment, which read as

WEB C follows:

“19. The principle of quantum meruit is often applied where for some technical reason a contract is held to be invalid. Under such circumstances an implied contract is assumed, by which the person for whom the work is to be done contracts to pay reasonable for the work done, to the person who does the work. The provisions of this section are based on the doctrine of quantum meruit, but the provisions of the Contract Act admit of a more liberal interpretation; the principle of the section being wider than the principle of quantum meruit. The principle has no application where there is a specific agreement in operation. A person who does work or who supplies goods under a contract, if no price is fixed, is entitled to be paid a reasonable sum for his labour and the goods supplied. If the work is outside the contract, the terms of the contract can have not application; and the contractor is entitled to be paid a reasonable price for such work as was done by him.

20. If a party to a contract has done additional construction for another not intending to do it gratuitously and such other has obtained benefit, the former is entitled to compensation for the additional work not covered by the contract. If an oral agreement is pleaded, which is not proved, he will be entitled to compensation under Section 70. Payment under this Section can also be claimed for



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

work done beyond the terms of the contract when the benefit of the work has been availed of by the defendant.”

Therefore, he would pray that the Writ Petitions be allowed and that the respondents be directed to make payments within the time fixed by this Court.

15. Per contra, *Mr.R.Sreedhar*, learned Additional Government Pleader, appearing on behalf of the respondents 1 to 5, places reliance on the counter-affidavits and certain additional documents filed by the respondents. He would submit that the fifth respondent, namely Pondicherry Adi Dravidar Development Corporation Limited, ought not to have indulged in the said exercise. The then Managing Director, without any expenditure sanction or permission from the Government, engaged in installing High Mast Lights/Mini Mast lights. Previously, this exercise was carried out, and inspections were made regarding the said sites. Proceedings were passed as far back as the year 2016-17, during which the already installed lights were inspected, and payments were released. It was ordered that no fresh work should be undertaken by PADCO without a detailed estimate. The learned counsel submits that in the earlier works, the total amount involved was also



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

WEB CODE

less than Rs. 5,00,000/-, and therefore, without any expenditure sanction and detailed estimate, work orders were granted, which is not the case in the present instance. The earlier amounts were lower, and although financial sanction was obtained, only tender was not floated. In the current cases, this is not so. It has been observed that in many places, the installation was either incomplete or not functioning. Therefore, it was explicitly ordered that the works should not be pursued further. The Lieutenant Governor, on 25.09.2017, also directed the authorities to discuss the matter forthwith. Given the serious allegations made, an order was also issued on 26.09.2017 stating that no proper ground assessment or study for the location of these lights had been conducted. In certain areas, the street lights themselves are sufficient, and installing High Mast Lights/Mini Mast lights would only be a waste of energy. It was further directed that no further erection of High Masts/Mini Mast lamps should be undertaken without a proper study or report. Additionally, it was ordered that there shall be no processing of fresh proposals for the installation of High Mast Lights/Mini Mast Lights without the prior concurrence of the Secretary.



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

16. The learned Additional Government Pleader asserts that,

even after this, the petitioners proceeded with the installation. They are all Class-I contractors with the PWD Department and are familiar with every procedure required before undertaking any work. They should not have proceeded without a proper contract. There is not even a work allotment order in this case. Therefore, in the absence of sanctioned expenditure for the work and without a proper contract or tender, the amounts cannot be paid. Accordingly, when this Court previously directed that the representations be considered, this was done, and the decision has been rightly rejected; thus, the petitioners are not entitled to any amounts. In any event, the petitioners must approach the Civil Court, as the entire liability is disputed and cannot be litigated before this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

17. I have considered the rival submissions and reviewed the material records of the case.



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

WEB COPY

18. The first question to be decided is whether the petitioners should be relegated to the Civil Court or if this Court can resolve the issue under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. This case does not involve a decision on liability due to any flaw or interpretation regarding the contract. Additionally, this is not a matter relating to the determination of quantum, as the respondents now seek to negate the entire claim. The rights and liabilities of the parties in this case extend beyond the contractual realm and pertain to issues of arbitrariness, propriety, and proportionality. Further, earlier the writ petitions were entertained and Advocate Commissioners were appointed and final orders were passed and this is a second round of litigation which was already entertained on merits. Therefore, I hold that the petitioners need not be relegated to the Civil Court, and this Court can entertain the issue under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

19. The next question is whether the petitioners are entitled to payment. As rightly contended by the learned Additional Government pleader, all is not well with the petitioners. They are Class-I contractors



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

WEB COPY

registered with the Public Works Department. When they are now claiming for work done amounting to about Rs. 24 Crores in total, it is undertaken without even a tender or a written work order. It cannot be said that the petitioners are not concerned with the inter-office procedure. They cannot plead complete ignorance of the procedure. Having said that, the actions of the Government of Puducherry are even more startling. It is not in the regular business of the fifth respondent, namely, the Puducherry Adi Dravidar Development Corporation Limited, to provide lighting. Even the High Mast lights should be provided in advantageous locations by the local bodies. In the name of providing illumination to the Scheduled Caste resident colonies, they have chosen all locations throughout various constituencies in the Puducherry and Karaikal regions and taken up this responsibility to themselves.

20. Firstly, this amounts to the siphoning of funds allocated to the Corporation for the Welfare of the Scheduled Caste Community towards general projects as except in a few locations where towers are situated for the benefit of the Scheduled Caste people, not all towers are located solely in



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

WEB COPY

such areas. Further when no budgetary sanction has been obtained, and the

Government took serious objections despite the matter being flagged by the

Lieutenant Governor as early as 2017, the Government of Puducherry has not

moved an inch. If it is their case that even the petitioners colluded with the

Managing Director, a criminal complaint ought to have been lodged in this

regard. We are now in the year 2025, the proceedings started from 2017 to

2019 . It is submitted that vigilance inquiry is still pending for about 8 years.

That is unacceptable. To top it all, a charge memorandum has been issued to

the then Managing Director, who is now also impleaded as a party

respondent in the Writ Petitions. This memorandum contains one charge that

the individual caused a loss to the Government without obtaining the

necessary expenditure. Therefore, the charge is also framed as if the

government has to pay the money. No conspiracy or collusion is alleged

against the petitioners.

21. Given this position, there was absolutely no communication from the Government of Puducherry between 2017 and 2019, even when further inspections were conducted to the petitioners. No communication was




W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

issued to the petitioners against the installation of the high mast lights.

Neither the local authorities were instructed to remove them or question why they were erected.

22. On the contrary, the report from the Commissioner reveals that electricity connections have been established for the High Mast Lights, which are currently in operation. The connections were taken by the Local bodies in their name. The learned Additional Government Pleader argues that these connections were made only for testing purposes. However, the learned counsel for the petitioners presents periodic electricity bill statements to support the assertion that many of these lights are burning continuously and are in regular use. Thus, it can be seen that apart from the absence of accusation of collusion or conspiracy, there is also a positive action from the local bodies in making use of the installations of the petitioners.

23. In this factual background, when both sides are on the wrong side of the law, this Court, in exercising its jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, should proceed only in the public interest.



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

WEB COPY

Therefore, neither the claim of the petitioners can be accepted, nor can the Government of Puducherry, after accepting the services and goods of the petitioners, can be permitted to assert that it will not pay any amount. The Director of Local Administration, along with the Commissioner of the concerned Municipality, or the official of Local Body concerned, with one official not below the rank of Executive Engineer from the Public Works Department, shall inspect each of the High Mast/Mini mast lights. If it is found to be necessary and useful to the location, as per the valuation that was made by the Advocate Commissioners, shall pay the amount to the locations. If the works are incomplete then such proportionate amounts be paid and the balance work can be completed by the local body concerned. Wherever, the officials find that the installations, as unnecessary and not useful for the general public, the petitioners shall be informed in writing and the petitioners shall be entitled to remove their materials. The inspection be done in the presence of the petitioners or their representatives if they choose to be present on the dates intimated by the authorities. The above will align with the equitable principle of quantum meruit as also the principles as per Section 70 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872. On the contrary, the impugned orders




W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

totally denying any amount to the petitioners cannot be sustained. On the one hand, the Government cannot use the High Mast/Mini Mast Lights though installed without proper procedure and deny the payment also on the ground of propriety. They cannot now return all the goods after their usage for about eight years.

24. In view thereof, the Writ Petitions are disposed of on the following terms:

- (i) The impugned orders bearing ref: No.1215/PADSTDC/EW/2023-24 dated 10.07.2023 shall stand quashed;
- (ii) The Director of Local Administration, along with the Commissioner of the concerned Municipality, or the official of Local Body concerned, with one official not below the rank of Executive Engineer from the Public Works Department, shall inspect each of the High Mast/Mini mast lights installed by the petitioners and as mentioned in the Advocate Commissioner's report;
- (iii) If they find the installation of High Mast/Mini Mast Light is appropriate and useful in the location to the general public, then as per the



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

WEB COPY

valuation that was made by the Advocate Commissioners, the petitioners

be paid for the installations;

(iv) If the works are incomplete also then such proportionate amounts be paid as per the Advocate Commissioner's report and the balance work can be completed by the local body concerned;


(v) Wherever, the officials find that the installations, as unnecessary and not useful for the general public, the petitioners shall be informed in writing and the petitioners shall be entitled to remove their materials;

(vi) The inspection be done in the presence of the petitioners or their representatives if they choose to be present on the dates intimated by the authorities;

(vii) The inspection shall be carried out within twelve weeks from the date of receipt of the web copy of the order without waiting for the certified copy of the order;

(viii) Upon completion of the exercise, due orders can be passed intimating the amount due to the petitioners and the locations where the petitioners have to dismantle and take back their belongings;

(ix) The amount as above shall be paid within a period of 12 weeks from



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

the date of such order. If the exercise is completed as per the above, the

petitioners will not be entitled to any further interest. If the above process

is delayed by the respondents then the petitioners will be entitled for 6%

interest on the amounts found due from today.

(x) No costs.

01.04.2025

Neutral Citation : No
dna



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

WEB COPY

- 1.The Chief Secretary
Government of Pondicherry
Pondicherry.
- 2.The Secretary
Department of Finance
Government of Pondicherry
Public Works Department
Puducherry 605 005.
- 3.The Secretary
Adi Dravidar Welfare Department
Government of Pondicherry
Pondicherry.
- 4.The Director
Adi Dravidar Welfare Department
Government of Pondicherry
Pondicherry.
- 5.The Managing Director
Pondicherry Adi Dravidar Development
Corporation (PADCO), No.30, II Cross
Pon Nagar, Rediyarpalayam, Pondicherry.
- 6.D.Ragunathan
Officer on Special Duty
Police Department (Retired)
No.9, Sai Street, 9th Cross, Krishna
Nagar, Puducherry.8



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.
dna

W.P.Nos.24664 & 24666 of 2023

01.04.2025