



## IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

## DATED: 27.02.2024

## CORAM

### THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

## <u>W.P.No.4953 of 2024</u> <u>&</u> <u>WMP Nos.5430, 5432, 5434, 5437 & 5438 of 2024</u>

- 1. M/s.Indralok Hotel Pvt. Ltd. Rep. By its Authorised Signatory, No.216, Poonamalee High Road, Kilpauk, Chennai-600 010.
- M/s.Pride Hotels Pvt. Ltd. Rep. By its Authorised Signtory, No.216 (869/B), Periyar EVR Salai, EVR Salai, Kilpauk, Chennai-600 010.

... Petitioners

vs

- 1. The Greater Chennai Corporation, Rep. by its Commissioner, Rippon Buildings, Chennai-600 003.
- 2. The Additional Commissioner (R & F) Greater Chennai Corporation, Rippon Buildings, Chennai-600 003.

... Respondents

<u>**PRAYER</u></u>: Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution https://www.mhc.tn.gof.India to issue a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the</u>** 



records pertaining to the demand notice dated 17.02.2024 issued by the 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent to the 1<sup>st</sup> Petitioner and the consequential sealing order issued by the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent dated 22.02.2024 and affixed in the premises of the 2<sup>nd</sup> petitioner's hotel and quash the same and consequently direct the Respondents 1 to 3 to de-seal the 2<sup>nd</sup> Petitioner's hotel "Pride Hotel" in premises bearing Door No.216(869/B), Periyar EVR Salai, EVR Salai, Kilpauk, Chennai-600 010 within a time frame to be fixed by thisCourt.

For Petitioners	:	Mr.P.Wilson, Senior Counsel for Richardson Wilson
For Respondents	:	Mr.P. Prithvi Chopda, Standing Counsel (Corporation)

#### <u>ORDER</u>

The petitioner assails a demand notice dated 17.02.2024 and a consequential notice dated 12.02.2024 which was affixed at the premises of the second petitioner. The half yearly property tax in respect of the Pride Hotel was fixed by the Taxation Appeals Tribunal in a sum of Rs.11,63,702/- with effect from the second half of 2006-07. The said order was carried in appeal by the Greater Chennai Corporation before the Principal Judge, City Civil Court, Chennai.





VEB COPY 2. By order dated 08.11.2023, the half yearly property tax was fixed in a sum of Rs.38,91,504/-. The impugned demand invoices were issued purportedly on the basis of the said order.

3. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned demand notices are not in consonance with the Tamil Nadu Urban Local Bodies Act, 1998. With reference to notice dated 17.02.2024, he points out that the notice period was only three days. Even as regards notice dated 22.02.2024, he submits that it was not issued by the Commissioner and that Section 116A of the above mentioned enactment stipulates a minimum period of 15 days for the petitioner to show cause. He further submits that the restaurant operated by the petitioner has been placed under seal and that the petitioners are unable to operate the said restaurant.

4. Mr.P.Prithvi Chopda, learned standing counsel for the respondents, submits that the demand notices were issued by computing property tax dues in accordance with order dated https://www.mhc.tn.g08/jlds2023 in M.T.A.No.19 of 2018. He further submits that the



web correctioners have 15 days' time to show cause against the notice dated web correction of the points out that such 15 day period would expire on 08.03.2024 and that no action would be taken until then. With regard to the sealing of the restaurant, learned counsel submits that the licence was not renewed. This contention is countered by learned senior counsel by placing on record the renewal of licence on 30.03.2023.

5. Since Section 116 A of the Tamil Nadu Urban Local Bodies Act, 1998 mandates that 15 days' time should be provided to the property tax assessee to respond to the notice before action is taken, there is no immediate threat to the petitioners. In light of the order dated 08.11.2023 in M.T.A.No.19 of 2018, the recourse available to the petitioners would be to challange such order. The immediate concern is with regard to the restaurant. The renewal dated 30.03.2023 extends the licence up to 31.03.2024. Therefore, the licence to operate the restaurant is in force as on date.

6. In these circumstances, this writ petition is disposed of with https://www.mhc.tn.gdh@ufollowing directions:





(i) The respondents are directed to de-seal the restaurant forthwith.

(ii) It is open to the petitioners to challenge the order dated 08.11.2023 in accordance with law.

(iii) It is also open to the respondents to take action in accordance with law if licence conditions are infringed.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed. No costs.

27.02.2024

Index : Yes / No

Internet : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

kal

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis





WEB CO1. The Greater Chennai Corporation, Rep. by its Commissioner, Rippon Buildings, Chennai-600 003.

> 2. The Additional Commissioner (R & F) Greater Chennai Corporation, Rippon Buildings, Chennai-600 003.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis





# SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY J.

kal

<u>W.P.No.4953 of 2024</u> <u>&</u> <u>WMP Nos.5430, 5432, 5434, 5437 & 5438 of 2024</u>

27.02.2024

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis