



W.P.(MD)No.5914 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 05.03.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN

W.P.(MD)No.5914 of 2025

Shajakhan

... Petitioner

VS.

1.The Commissioner of Corporation,
O/o., Thiruchirapalli Corporation,
Thiruchirapalli District.

2.The Assistant Commissioner,
O/o., Thiruchirapalli Corporation,
Thiruchirapalli District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents 1 and 2 to extend the petitioner's tender license period for next 2 years for the purpose to make him to remove the bulk entertainment machineries and other kinder objects from the Anna Science Park situated at Ward 28, Anna Nagar, Sivaprakasham Road, Trichy District, based on the earliest representation given by the petitioner dated 20.01.2025 and 21.01.2025.



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.5914 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.SMA.Jinnah

For Respondents : Mr.K.R.Kishore Ram
for M/s.R.B.Law Associates

ORDER

The petitioner seeks for mandamus to direct the respondents to extend the period of license granted to the petitioner by further period of two years by considering his representations dated 20.01.2025 and 21.01.2025.

2. The petitioner was granted license for the maintenance and upkeep of Anna Science Park situated at Anna Nagar, Sivaprakasham Road, Thiruchirappalli District. The period of license was from 08.03.2024 to 07.03.2025. In addition, he had paid a sum of Rs. 7,55,030/- (Rupees Seven Lakh Fifty Five Thousand and Thirty only) on the request of the respondents to deal with certain advertisement boards in Tiruchirappalli. He pleads that he had suffered heavy loss and therefore, he had requested the respondents to extend the license by further period of two years. As the same was not considered, he has come forward with the present writ petition.

2/5



W.P.(MD)No.5914 of 2025

WEB COPY

3. I heard Mr.SMA.Jinnah for the petitioner and Mr.K.R.Kishore Ram for the respondents.

4. The petitioner, even when he took the license to maintain the park, was aware that the period of lease was between 08.03.2024 and 07.03.2025 . If I were to grant the relief as sought for by the petitioner, I would literally be rewriting the contract between the petitioner and the corporation. This Court has no power to rewrite the contract.

5. Mr.SMA.Jinnah points out that the first respondent had given a similar extension to one Ibrahim for running another park and therefore, he pleads he has to be treated on par with Ibrahim's park.

6. It is upto the first respondent to decide as to whom he wants to give an extension of license. There cannot be a plead of equality when it comes to the matters for license. I am not inclined to give a direction to dispose of the representation, since the petitioner has no legal right.



W.P.(MD)No.5914 of 2025

WEB COPY 7. In view of the above discussion, this Writ Petition is dismissed.

No costs.

Index :Yes / No
Internet :Yes / No
NCC :Yes / No
Rmk

05.03.2025



WEB COPY



W.P.(MD)No.5914 of 2025

V. LAKSHMINARAYANAN, J.

Rmk

W.P.(MD)No.5914 of 2025

05.03.2025