

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED:28-02-2006

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P.K. MISRA

WRIT PETITION Nos.26358 to 26362 of 2001, 683, 1298,
2181, 4029, 4030, 4104, 7507, 7580, 8126, 9809,
9810, 11092, 11364, 12795, 12953, 15064, 12588/2002,
19780 and 19781 of 2004

and

WPMP.Nos.3017, 10353, 10435, 14978, 15321, 17225, 17432, 17433,
50133, 16951, 5657, 5659, 9176, 9177,
23784 and 23786/2004 and WVMP.No.1414 of 2002

Seshasayee Paper and Boards Limited,
Palliapalayam,
Namakkal District,
rep. by its Vice President
(Finance) and Secretary Mr.V.Pichai

... Petitioner in
W.P.No.26358/01

Vs.

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Secretary to
Government, Public Works Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai 9.

... Respondent in
W.P.No.26358/01 to
26362/2001 and 9809, 9810,
12795/2002 R1 in WP.683,
1298, 2181, 4029,4030, 4104,
7507, 7580, 8126, 11092,
11364, 12953, 15064, 12588,
19781/2004

M/S.Amaravathi Sri Venkatesa
Paper Mills Ltd.,
Madathukulam, Udumalpet-642 113
rep. by its Chief Engineer
Shri P.Devarajan.

Petitioner in
WP.26359/2001

WEB COPY

M/S.Rajalakshmi Paper Mills Ltd.,
Madathukulam, Udumalpet-642113
rep. by its Chief Engineer
Shri P.Devarajan.

Petitioner in
WP.26360/2001

M/S.Vishnuvardhan Paper Mills Pvt. Ltd.,
Madathukulam, Udumalpet - 642 113
rep. by its Chief Engineer
Shri P.Devarajan.

Petitioner in
WP.26361/2001

M/S.V.G.Paper & Boards Ltd.,
Madathukulam, Udumalpet - 642 113
rep. by its Chief Engineer
Shri.P.Devarajan.

Petitioner in
WP.26362/2001

M/S.T.T.K.Health Care Limited
(Paper Division) Formerly
TTK.Pharma Ltd., (Paper Division
and prior to that M/S.T.T.Maps and
Publications Ltd., (Paper Division)
rep. by its Vice President,
Company Secretary Mr.S.Kalyanaraman.

vs

2)Balkart Brothers India Pvt., Ltd.,
Pungar, Bhavani Sagar - 638 451
Erode District.

R2 impleaded as per order of Court
dated 29.4.2002 in WMP.19067/2002.

Petitioner and
Second Respondent
in WP.683/2002

The Madras Aluminium Company Ltd.,
having its Regd. Office at
Mettur Dam - 636 402 and rep. by
its Secretary.

vs

2.The Executive Engineer
Public Works Department
Mettur Division, Mettur Dam.

3.The Superintending Engineer
PWD, Water Resources Organisation
Upper Cauvery Basin Circle
Salem-7.

Petitioner and
Respondents 2 and 3
in WP.1298/2002

M/S.Dalmia Cement (Bharat)Ltd.,
Dalmiapuram
Tiruchirapalli District
rep.by Manager Mr.V.Muralidharan.

vs

2.The Executive Engineer
Public Works Department
WRO/RC Division
Trichy-1.

Petitioner and
Second Respondent
in WP.2181/2002

Sakthi Sugars Limited
180, Race Course Road
Coimbatore - 641 018.
rep. by its Deputy General Manager
(Legal and Taxation) Sri P.Sankararaja Pandian

vs

2.Executive Engineer, P.W.D.
Water Resources Organisation
Bhavani Sagar Dam Division
Bhavani Sagar - 638 451.

Petitioner and
Second Respondent
in WP.4029/2002

WEB COPY

Bannari Amman Sugars Ltd.,
having its Registered Office at
Mettupalayam Road, Coimbatore-641 018
rep. by its Assistant Secretary
Mr.C.Palaniswamy.

vs

2.Executive Engineer, P.W.D.,
Water Resources Organisation
Bhavani Sagar Dam Division
Bhavani Sagar - 638 451.

Petitioner and
Second Respondent
in WP.4030/2002

M/S.Chemplast Sanmar Ltd.,
No.9, Cathedral Road
Chennai-86. Rep. by its
Assistant Vice President.

Vs

2.The Executive Engineer
Mettur Division
Mettur.

Petitioner and
Second Respondent
in WP.4104/2002

S.S.M.Processing Mills Ltd.,
75-A, Edapady Road
Kumarapalayam-638 183
Namakkal District
rep. by Director

VS

2.The Superintending Engineer
Public Works Department
Mettur.

3.The Executive Engineer
Public Works Department
Mettur Dam Division
Mettur Dam-1.

Petitioner and
Respondents 2 and 3
in WP.7507/2002

Kamala Sugar Mills Ltd.,
Amaravathinagar, Udumalpet-642 102
rep. by its Production Manager
Mr.S.Kitchanna.

Vs

2.The Executive Engineer
Public Works Department
Water Resources Organisation
Amaravathi Basin Division
Karur.

3.The Special Chief Engineer
Public Works Department
Water Resources Organisation
Palani.

4.The Superintending Engineer
WRO/Special Project Circle
Palani.

Petitioner and
Respondents 2 to 4
in WP.7580/2002

M/S.Steel Authority of India Ltd.,
Salem Steel Plant
Salem 636 013

vs

2.The Executive Engineer
Public Works Department
Mettur Division, Mettur Dam.

3.The Superintending Engineer
PWD, Water Resources Organisation
Upper Cauvery Basin
Salem-7.

Petitioner and
Respondents 2 and 3
in WP.8126/2002

Shri Hari Krishnan Papers Pvt., Ltd.,
Nallur, Pushpathur Village
Palani Taluk - 624 618
Dindugal District
rep. by its Director
Mr.M.Velusamy

Petitioner in
WP.9809/2002

GVG Paper Mills (P) Ltd.,
Nallur, Pushpathur Village
Palani Taluk - 624 618
Dindugal District
rep. by its Director Mr.M.Amarnath.

Petitioner in
WP.9810/2002

J.K.K.Textile Processing Mills Ltd.,
Pudur Perumapalayam
Komarapalayam - 638 183
Namakkal District rep. by its
Managing Director J.K.A.Kandasamy.

vs

2.The Superintending Engineer
Public Works Department
Mettur.

3.The Executive Engineer
Public Works Department
Mettur Dam-1.

Petitioner and
Respondents 2 and 3
in WP.11092/2002

Trichy Distilleries and Chemicals Ltd.,
Mahalakshmi Mansion, I Floor
14, 1st Main Road, Gandhi Nagar
Adyar, Chennai-20. Rep. by its
Managing Director Mr.V.T.Somasundaram

vs

2.The Executive Engineer
PWD/WRO, R.C.Divison
Trichy-620 001.

Petitioner and
Second Respondent
in WP.11364/2002

Tamilnadu Newsprint and Papers Ltd.,
rep.by its Chief Manager
(Legal and Vigilance)
Mr.S.Meenakshisundaram, No.67,
Mount Road,Guindy, Chennai-600 032.

Petitioner in
WP.12795/2002.

M/S.Dharmapuri Paper Mills Pvt., Ltd.,
rep. by its Managing Director, 96,
Luz Church Road, Mylapore,Chennai-600 004.

vs

2.The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department
Chepauk, Madras-5.

3.The Executive Engineer
Public Works Department
Dhamapuri Division,Dharmapuri.

4.The Superintending Engineer
Public Works Department
WRO, Pennaiyar Basin Division
Tiruvannamalai - 3.

Petitioner and
Respondents 2 to 4
in WP.12953/2002

M/S.United Bleachers
Nellithurai Road,Mettupalayam
Coimbatore District rep. by its
General Manager S.Gopalakrishnan

vs

2.The Executive Engineer
Water Resources Organisation
Bhavani Sagar Dam Division
Bhavani - 638 451.

Petitioner and
2nd Respondent
in WP.15064/2002

M/S.Sri Venkatesa Processors Ltd.,
(formerly known as Sri Venkatesa Mills Ltd.,
Bleaching and Dyeing Factory)
rep. by its Authorised Signatory
Mr.R.Raju, 5/1 - D, Vadugapalayam
Pollachi Road,Palladam (P.O),
Coimbatore District.

vs

2.The Executive Engineer, PWD
Water Resources Organisation
Amaravathi Basin Division, Karur.

3.The Special Chief Engineer, PWD
Water Resources Organisation/
Special Project Circle, Palani.

Petitioner and
Respondents 2 and 3
in WP.12588/2002.

M/S.Amaravathy Co-OP., Sugar Mills Ltd.,
Krishnapuram, Coimbatore District - 642 111
rep. by its Special Officer

vs

1.The Chief Engineer
PWD WRO, Chennai Region
Chepauk, Chennai-5.

2.The Executive Engineer
Public Works Department
Water Resources Organisation
Amaravathy Basin Division
Karur.

Petitioner in
WP.Nos.19780,19781/2004
and
Respondents 1 and 2 in
WP.No.19780/2004
and
Respondents 2 and 3
in WP.19781/2004

Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of writ of certiorari and certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records of the proceedings of the respondent/1st Respondent relating to the impugned G.O.Ms.No.474 PWD dated 13.11.2001 and quash the same.(WP.26358 to 26362/2001, 683, 1298, 4104, 8126, 9809, 9810, 12795 and 15064 of 2002 and 19781/2004) respectively.

1. and the consequential order bearing No.A3/15(90)/2001 dated 24.12.2001 of the 2nd respondent and quash the said orders. (WP.2181/2002).

2. and the consequential order letter No.TS/JDO-2/F.W.D/39m/2001 dated 24.1.2002 of the second respondent and quash the same. (WP.4029/2002).

3. and the consequential letter No.TS/JDO-2/F.W.D/39m/2001 dated 24.1.2002 of the second respondent and quash the same(WP.4030/2002).

4. and that of the 3rd respondent in connection with the impugned letter No.TS/DOI/F.Court case/307M/2001 dated 11.12.2001 and Ka.No.Va.Pi/Va.1/Ko.S.S.M./35M/02 dated 4.2.2002 and quash the same. (WP.7507/2004).

5. and the consequential order bearing Lr.No.RC99/cashier/244 dated 7.2.2002 issued by the 2nd respondent and letter No.A1/1642/2001 dated 13.2.2002 issued by the 3rd respondent and quash the same(WP.7580/2002).

6. and that of the 3rd respondent in connection with the impugned letter No.TS/DOI/F.Court case/307M/2001 dated 11.12.2001 and order No.1608A/2001/U.Se.PO/F68A dated 23.1.2002 and quash the same.(WP.11092/2002).

7. and letter No.A-3/3/90/2001 dated 23.3.2002 and to quash the same.(WP.11364/2002).

8. and letter dated 15.3.2002 issued by the 4th respondent and quash the same as illegal and unconstitutional and consequently forebear the respondents from collecting any arrears of water charges from the petitioner.(WP.12953/2002).

9. and the consequential order bearing Lr.No.RC 99/2002/cashier/244 dated 7.2.2002 and letter No.A1/1642/2001 dated 13.2.2002 passed by the 2nd respondent and 3rd respondent respectively and quash the same(WP.12588/2002).

10. to call for the records relating to the proceedings of the second respondent notice No.77/2004/Kasalar/dated 16.6.2004 quash the same(WP.19780/2004).

For Petitioners in W.P.Nos.26358 to 26362 of 2001,
683, 2181, 7580, 9809, 9810, 4029, 4030 & 12588 of 2002
Mr.T.R. Rajagopalan, Senior Advocate for M/s. Aiyar & Dolia

For Petitioner in W.P.No.2181 of 2002
Mrs. Nalini Chidambaram, Senior Advocate for
M/s. Aiyar & Dolia

For Petitioner in W.P.No.15064 of 2002
Mr.R. Gandhi, Senior Advocate for
Mr.R.G. Narendhiran

For Petitioner in W.P.No.4104 of 2002
Mr.R. Sasidharan

For Petitioners in W.P.Nos.1298 & 12953 of 2002
Mr. Sathish Parasaran

For Petitioner in W.P.No.8126 of 2002
Mr.T.R. Rajagopalan, Senior Advocate for

M/s. Ramasubramaniam & Associates

For Petitioners in W.P.Nos.11092 & 7507 of 2002
Mr.B. Ravi Raja

For Petitioner in W.P.No.11364 of 2002
Mr.S. Jayaraman

For Petitioner in W.P.No.12795 of 2002
Mr.Shivakumar for M/s. Shivakumar & Suresh

For Petitioners in W.P.Nos.19780 & 19781 of 2004
Mr.K. Rajasekaran

For Respondent No.2 in W.P.No.683 of 2002
Mr.A. Sashidharan

For Respondent No.1 in all the W.Ps
Mr.R. Muthukumaraswamy, Addl. Advocate General
assisted by Mr.S. Kandaswamy, Special Govt. Pleader

COMMON JUDGMENT

All these writ petitions, which were heard analogously, raise similar question of facts and law and are being disposed of by this common judgment.

2. All these writ petitions have been filed to quash the order passed by the Government in G.O.Ms.No.474 dated 13.11.2001. The petitioners are various industries which have been permitted by the Government to draw water from Cauveri river or other tributaries of Cauveri. The common questions raised by all the petitioners revolve round the steep hike of the charges required to be paid by the petitioners for drawing water from such water sources. As per G.O.Ms.No.1307 dated 16.4.1947, the rate of water charges had been fixed at Rs.6/- per 1000 cubic yards. This was increased to Rs.12/- per 1000 cubic yards in G.O.Ms.No.1435 dated 6.6.1964 and such charge was fixed at Rs.16/- per 1000 cubic metres (obviously after introduction of metric system) as per G.O.Ms.No.434 dated 22.2.1966. Thereafter the rate was fixed at Rs.30/- per 1000 cubic metres as per G.O.Ms.No.1446 dated 4.10.1975. After lapse of about a decade, such rate was increased to Rs.60/- per 1000 cubic metres as per G.O.Ms.No.517 dated 10.3.1986. Subsequently, by G.O.Ms.No.890 dated

9.5.1991, such rate was increased more than eight times and was pegged at Rs.500/- per 1000 cubic metres. Such G.O.Ms.No.890 dated 9.5.1991 effected changes in respect of two material terms. The first change was relating to fixing of rate at Rs.500/-per 1000 cubic metres and other change was incorporation of a provision to the effect that industries were required to pay in advance on the basis of the estimate of quantum of water required without any right for refund of any amount on the ground that less quantity than the estimated quantity had been consumed or used by the industry concerned. So far as the revision of rate was concerned, a batch of writ petitions, such as W.P.No.9333 of 1992, had been filed questioning such increase. The other condition relating to the effect that the industries are required to pay on the estimate of the quantum required for the year without any right of refund was challenged in another batch, namely, W.P.No.15720 of 1994. In the later batch of writ petitions, the main contention was to the effect that the industries were asked to pay on the actual quantity drawn and utilised. This later batch of cases had been dismissed by a learned single Judge of this Court by order dated 9.8.2002 and it is stated that Writ Appeals filed against such order are pending. So far as challenge in respect of enhancement of rate is concerned, W.P.No.9333 of 1992 and other connected matters were disposed of by a learned single Judge by order dated 24.12.1999. Since such order has some bearing on the questions now raised, it is necessary to extract the relevant portion of such order.

"2. In the above G.O.Ms.No.890/PWD dt.9.5.91 the Government has enhanced the charges for water drawn for industrial purposes from Govt. sources. They have enhanced the water charges from Rs.60/- to Rs.500/- or different rates depending upon the capacity of the industry to draw the water from Govt. Sources. The senior counsel appearing in this matter has argued that there are no basis of guidelines for coming to the conclusion to enhance the water charges from the minimum rate of Rs.60/- to a maximum rate of Rs.500/-. He has also argued that the Government has not called upon the petitioners to put forth their objections before enhancing the water charges. Under the above circumstances the petitioners are ready to submit representation to the Government to re-consider the Government Order basing on their objections.

3. Under the above circumstances, without going into the merits of the case, it is suffice to give liberty to the petitioners to file their objections within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. Thereafter the respondents shall dispose of the representations after affording an opportunity to the petitioners. Further liberty is given to the petitioners

to raise all their objections that have been raised in these writ petitions. The respondents are further directed to consider and pass appropriate orders afresh as expeditiously as possible. Till such time, the petitioners have to follow the interim direction given by this Court. Further the respondents are directed not to enforce the Government Order, pending the passing of the orders afresh."

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid direction, the impugned G.O.Ms.No.474 dated 13.11.2004 has been issued by the Government. As per such G.O., the rate has been fixed as follows :-

(i) For new industries, upto a period of five years from the date of commencement of their production/operations, the rate will be 30 (thirty) paise per 1000 (thousand) litres subject to a minimum of Rs.3000 (Rupees three thousand only) per annum, and thereafter 50 (fifty) paise per 1000 (thousand) litres subject to a minimum of Rs.5000/- (Rupees five thousand only) per annum.

(ii) For the existing industries, the rate will be 50 (fifty) paise per 1000 (thousand) litres subject to a minimum of Rs.5000/- (Rupees five thousand only) per annum."

As per paragraph 5 of the said G.O., the revised rates had been made effective from 9.5.1991, i.e., the date on which earlier G.O.Ms.No.890 had been issued. This latest order of the Government has been challenged by various industries in the present batch of writ petitions.

4. The main contentions are to the following effect:-

(a) There has been steep and arbitrary hike in the rate in the year 1991 and, inspite of the direction of the High Court for reconsideration, under the impugned order, the Government has fixed the very same rate, which has been made effective from 9.5.1991.

(b) Rate has been fixed at Rs.3000/- for new industries, whereas rate has been fixed at Rs.5000/- for the existing industries. The existing industries are thus hostilely discriminated without any rhyme or reason.

(c) The amount should not be collected on the basis of estimated quantum, but on the basis of actual quantum used.

(d) The order should not have been made effective from a retrospective date.

5. A counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the Government justifying the increase of the rate. It has been stated that in view of the acute shortage of water, particularly in the Cauvery basin, it is necessary to regulate use of water for industrial purpose and the rate has been fixed with a view to regulate such use. It is also stated that as a matter of fact the State is required to spend much more amount for the purpose of supplying drinking water and the rate fixed for industrial use is much less than the rate fixed for supply of drinking water. It is further stated that the rate fixed earlier was indeed very low and the present rate cannot be said to be very exorbitant, particularly keeping in view the fact that proportion of expenditure on such component is very minimal so far as the industries are concerned.

6. The right of the State Government to collect charges for permitting various industries to draw and use water has not been questioned. All the Counsels appearing for the petitioners almost in one voice have submitted that even though the right of the Government to collect charges is not in dispute, the rate fixed by the Government is exorbitantly high and such rate has been fixed arbitrarily, more particularly when the Government is not required to spend any amount for the water sources concerned, which are natural water sources. It has been highlighted by the petitioners that the rate had been fixed at Rs.6/- per 1000 cubic yards in 1947, which was increased to Rs.12/- in 1964 and altered to Rs.16/- per 1000 cubic metres in 1966 and thereafter increased to Rs.30/- in the year 1975 and further increased to Rs.60/- in the year 1986. It has been submitted that such increase was being effected on each occasion after a gap of about 10 to 12 years and the increased rate was almost twice the rate fixed previously. However, in the present case, the Government after about five years, increased the rate by 800% or by more than eight times without any justification.

7. The aforesaid submission, even though attractive on the face of it, does not merit acceptance. The amount to be collected for the aforesaid purpose is essentially a question of policy to be fixed by the Government by taking into account the various facts and circumstances and ordinarily a court of law is not expected to sit in appeal in such matters. It has been pointed out by the learned Addl. Advocate General appearing for the State that compared to the amount paid by the persons for getting water for domestic use, the rate charged from the industrialists for industrial use appears to be much low. Moreover, as rightly pointed by him, the proportion of expenses incurred by the industry on account of the water rate charged by the Government appears to be minimal as compared to other expenses. According to him the amount charged previously was disproportionately low. These are obviously relevant considerations on the basis of which the Government has fixed the amount chargeable and it cannot be said that the rate fixed by the Government is

arbitrary, warranting any interference by the High Court in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution.

8. In the above connection, a contention has been raised by the learned counsels appearing for the petitioners to the effect that the impugned G.O.Ms.No.474 dated 13.11.2001 should not be applied retrospectively with effect from 9.5.1991. This submission is again attractive only on the surface.

9. It is to be noticed that G.O.Ms.No.474 dated 13.11.2001 has been passed consequent to the order of the learned single Judge dated 24.12.1999 in W.P.No.9333 of 1991 and other connected matters, where under the increase of rate to Rs.500/- per 1000 cubic metres was under challenge and the learned single Judge has merely directed that the matter should be reconsidered after giving opportunity to the industries to submit their view points. A fair reading of such earlier decision makes it clear that the order earlier passed had not been quashed as such, but only a scope had been given for reconsideration of the same. Since the Government after reconsideration and taking into account the various submissions and suggestions made by the industries has come to the conclusion that the rate fixed at Rs.500/- is reasonable, there is nothing arbitrary in directing that such rate should be made applicable with effect from 9.5.1991, the date on which earlier G.O.Ms.No.890 was issued. As a matter of fact, the learned single Judge had observed that till the matter is re-examined, the industries would be required to pay at the old rate for the time being, which clearly implies that the rate can be re-fixed with effect from the earlier date. A perusal of the earlier order dated 24.12.1999 clearly indicates that the earlier G.O.Ms.No.890 dated 9.5.1991 had been kept in abeyance pending consideration, but there was no embargo on the Government to fix any rate effective from 9.5.1991. Such contention is therefore not acceptable.

10. Learned counsels appearing for the petitioners have also submitted that the rate should be fixed on the basis of actual consumption. It is submitted by the counsels that the amount of water actually drawn by the industry concerned can be measured and, therefore, the amount should be collected on the basis of actual user and not on the basis of estimated quantum of water likely to be drawn.

11. As rightly submitted by the learned Additional Advocate General, this question was already raised in W.P.No.15720 of 1994, etc., and the matter is now pending in appeal and therefore it would not be appropriate for me to express any opinion at this stage and obviously the matter can be agitated in the writ appeals. This question is therefore left open to be decided appropriately in the writ appeals.

12. In this connection, a contention has been raised by some of the learned counsels that the water is drawn only for cooling purpose and thereafter such water is re-diverted to the very same river.

13. Learned Addl. Advocate General has pointed out that only two companies, namely, M/s.E.I.D. Parrys and M/s.Cauvery Sugars and Chemicals draw water for cooling purpose and, so far as these companies are concerned, they are charged at the concessional rate of Rs.20/- per 1000 Cubic Metre in terms of Government letter dated 22.6.1987 and, therefore, they cannot have any grievance. This submission of the learned Addl. Advocate General is also acceptable.

14. Some of the learned counsels have raised contention relating to violation of Article 14 of the Constitution. It is submitted by them that the new industries are allowed to use water at the rate of Rs.3000/- per annum, whereas the existing industries are allowed to use such water at the rate of Rs.5,000/- per annum.

15. I do not think such a submission can be taken seriously. It is quite well known that various State Governments in order to encourage new industries, provide certain concessions to them in the matter relating to supply of electricity or payment of sales tax, etc. The obvious object being to increase the number of new industries, the classification can be said to be reasonable and has some nexus with the object to be achieved. Therefore, in my opinion, the attack on the ground of discrimination dissipates and cannot be sustained.

16. In the above view of the matter, the contentions raised by various writ petitioners being unacceptable all the writ petitions are liable to be dismissed.

17. During pendency of earlier writ petitions and the present writ petition, the petitioners have been permitted to pay at a lesser rate. Since the writ petitions are dismissed, it is obvious that such petitioners are liable to pay the balance amount on the basis of G.O.Ms.No.474 dated 13.11.2001. It is brought to my notice that interest is being demanded for payment of the amount. If any of the petitioners make the payment due within a period of two months from the date of receipt of this order and apply for waiver of interest, such petition for waiver of interest may be considered by the Respondents.

18. Subject to the observations made in paras 11 and 17, all the writ petitions are dismissed. However, there would be no

order as to costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

dpk

Sd/
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar

To

1. The Secretary to Government of Tamilnadu,
Public Works Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai 9.

2. The Executive Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Mettur Division, Mettur Dam.

3. The Superintending Engineer,
PWD, Water Resources Organisation,
Upper Cauvery, Basin Circle, Salem-7.

4. The Executive Engineer,
Public Works Department,
WRO/RC.Division, Tiruchy-620 001.

5. The Executive Engineer,
P.W.D, water Resources
Organisation, Bhavani Sagar Dam Divison,
Bhavani Sagar-638 451

6. The Executive Engineer,
Mettur Division, Mettur.

7. The Superintending Engineer,
Public Works Department, Mettur.

8. The Executive Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Mettur Dam Division,
Mettur Dam-1

9. The Executive Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Water Resources Organisation,
Amaravathi Basin Division, Karur.

10. The Special Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Water Resources Organisation, Palani.

11. The Superintending Engineer,
WRO/Special Project Circle, Palani-1.

12. The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Chepauk, Madras-5.

13. The Executive Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Dharmapuri Division, Dharmapuri.

14. The Superintending Engineer,
Public Works Department,
WRO, Penniyar Basin Division,
Thiruvannamalai 3.

15. The Chief Engineer,
PWD, WRO, Chennai Region,
Chepauk, Chennai-5.

16. The Special Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Water Resources Organisation/
Special Project Circle, Palani.

+1 CC to Mr.Satish Parasharan, Advocate, SR No.10065
+2 CCs to Mr.B.Ravi Raja, Advocate, SR No.9795 & 9796.
+2 CCs to the Government Pleader, Sr No.9561 & 9432
+8 CCs to M/s.Aiyar & Dolia, Advocate, SR No.9482
+1 CC to Mr.S.Jayaraman, Advocate, SR No.9473
+1 CC to Mr.R.G.Narendhiran, Advocate, SR No.9414
+1 CC to Mr.C.D.Johnson, Advocate, SR No.9548

VC (CO)
BG/RSM/9.3.2006

COMMON JUDGMENT IN
WP.NOs.26358 to 26362/01 & batch