

Petitioner Vs. Respondent

Petitioner Vs. Respondent

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1191692

Court : Chennai Madurai

Decided On : Apr-04-2016

Judge : B. Rajendran

Appeal No. : W.P(MD)Nos. 4738 of 2015 & 1222 7 2566 of 2016 & M.P(MD)Nos. 1 of 2015, & WMP(MD)Nos. 994, 995, 1064, 2269, 2270 of 2016

Appellant : Petitioner

Respondent : Respondent

Judgement :

B. Rajendran, J.

1. Today, these matters have come up for hearing under the caption "For Being Mentioned" at the instance of the learned Counsel for the petitioner, stating that the collection amount has been wrongly furnished by him as Rs.14,00,000/- which meant for both 'Pay and Use Toilet' as well as 'Cloak Room', but the actual amount to be furnished is Rs.10,00,000/- only in respect of 'Cloak Room'.

2. As far as the petitioner is concerned, the amount should be only for the 'Cloak Room' and in such a case, only a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- has to be collected by the Corporation. Therefore, a typographical error made in the order as per the representation made by the learned Counsel for the petitioner as Rs.14,00,000/- is wrong, as admitted by both parties.

3. Today, to show his bona fides, the petitioner paid Rs.10,00,000/- which is the actual amount payable even on demand by the Corporation through Demand Draft. Therefore, in the order dated 11.03.2016 in paragraphs 2 and 3, the amount shall be read as Rs.10,00,000/- instead of Rs.14,00,000/-. Further he submitted that the petitioner has got liberty to seek the refund of the amount insofar as the non-occupation for three months period. It is for the Department to consider and decide on the representation made by the petitioner.

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com