IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE, MADURAI

PRESENT: THIRU.M.SAISARAVANAN, M.L.,
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE
MADURAI

Monday, this the 27th day of July, 2026

C.M.A.(CS). No.23/2018 & I.A.No.1/2025

(CNR No. TNMD01-004561-2018)

I.A.No.1/2025:-

M. Veerakumar ... Petitioner/Appellant

/Vs./

The Deputy Registrar (Housing),
Madurai Circle, Madurai. ... Respondent/Respondent

Counsel for Petitioner: Thiru.R.Selvamani, Learned Counsel
Counsel for Respondent: Learned Government Pleader

C.M.A.(CS).No.23/2018:-

M. Veerakumar ... Appellant

/Vs./

The Deputy Registrar (Housing),
Madurai Circle, Madurai. ... Respondent

On appeal against the Surcharge Order passed by the respondent/Deputy Registrar (Housing), Madurai Circle, Madurai, under

Section 87 of Tamil Nadu Co-Operative Societies Act against the appellant in Tha.Va.No.8/2016-17, dated 16.05.2018.

Between

The Deputy Registrar (Housing)
Madurai Circle, Madurai. ... Suo motu Surcharge Presiding Officer

/Vs./

1. M. Veerakumar
2. D. Suresh ... Defendants.

Counsel for Appellant: Thiru.R.Selvamani, Learned Counsel
Counsel for Respondent: Learned Government Pleader

This Civil Miscellaneous Appeal along with interlocutory applications were coming up for final hearing on 23.06.2026 in the presence of learned counsels as stated supra and upon hearing the arguments of both side counsels and upon perusing the material records, and having stood over for consideration till date, this court passing the following. . .

COMMON JUDGMENT

I.A.No.1/2025:-

This petition is filed by the petitioner/Appellant under Order 41 Rule 27 and 151 of CPC to receive the additional documents filed along with this petition.

C.M.A.C.S.No.23/2018:-

This appeal has been filed u/Sec.152(1) of Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies Act, 1983 to set aside the Surcharge Order passed by the respondent under Section 87 of Tamil Nadu Co-Operative Societies Act against the appellant in Tha.Va.No.8/2016-17, dated 16.05.2018.

2. AVERMENTS OF THE PETITION FILED IN I.A.NO.1/2025 IN CMA(CS) IS AS FOLLOWS:-

The petitioner/appellant has been working as a Clerk/Secretary (in-charge of the MD Spl 33 Periakulam Co-operative Housing Soceity, Periakulam) for the period from 01.04.2005 to 17.11.2009 as for as the duties and responsibilities of concern, the petitioner/appellant had been working as a Clerk cum Secretary (in-charge). It has been admitted by the respondent. The respondent/respondent has initiated the surcharge proceedings in Ta.Va.No.08/2016-2017 dated 16.05.2018. The allegation as against the petitioner is that as against the Registrar circular that the petitioner had utilized the society's fund by way diversification of fund and getting salary for the tune of Rs.56,38,336/-. Therefore, the respondent/respondent has conducted the 87 proceedings and passed orders as against the petitioner and one D.Suresh, the Successor Secretary in-charge of the society. As far as the circular Na.Ka.154/2012 A3 dated

14.05.2012 is concerned, that the circular is not squarely applicable to this surcharge proceeding because as far as the particular circular is concerned, that circular should have applied only for the Primary Agricultural Co-operative Societies, not for the Housing Societies, moreover as far as the salary getting by the petitioner only on the recommendations and gave order by way of resolution alone, that particular salaries were received by the petitioner. Moreover in that particular society, a settlement arrived under Section 18(1) of the ID Act 1947 dated 24.09.1999 from the period that settlement was neither nullified nor cancelled by the management at any point of time. In that particular settlement stated as follows:- " இவ்வொப்பந்தம் 01.07.1998 முதல் 30.06.2003 வரை ஐந்தாண்டு காலம் வரையும் அமுலில் இருக்கும் எனவும் இவ்வொப்பந்த காலம் முடிவுற்ற பின்னர் இருதரப்பினரும் புதிய ஒப்பந்தம் ஏற்படுத்திக் கொள்ளும்வரை இந்த ஒப்பந்தசரத்துக்கள் தொடர்ந்து அமுலில் இருக்கும்" என ஒப்புக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது. As per the 18(1) settlement alone the salaries were given to the Employees of the society. Accordingly the concerned Special Officer of the Society has admitted the same accordingly the salaries were disbursed to meand employees of the society. Therefore, the copy of the settlement was not at all considered by the Section 81 Enquiry Officer as well as the respondent in the surcharge case. Therefore, the particular documents are not available with the lower court recrds. Hence, necessarily that 18(1) settlement should have received by this court. Yet another document is nothing but as for the surcharge procedings and 81 enquiry report totally 17 loans were collected during the period which had been working by the petitioner/appellant. For which after collecting loan amounts the salaries were obtained by the petitioner/appellant. Moreover that particular period 17 loans were not cleared apart from that and as per the allegation of the respondent the clear violation of the petitioner/appellant that as and when the loans are collected from the concern person the documents pertaining to the loan could have been returned from the Tamil Nadu Co-operative Housing Federation, Chennai. As far as the particular allegation are concerned it is reliably learned that as far as the 17 loans which are mentioned by the 81 enquiry officer, eventhough the concern member has paid the entire loan, the documents could not be released fromt he Housing Federation. But unfortunately after the 87 proceedings the petitioner has received a documents pertaining to the above 17 loans are concerned all documents were returned to the concerned 17 members for which the Tamil Namu Co-operative housing Federation has sent a letter on 18.09.2017 and stating that 17 loans are concerned all amounts were collected accordingly the loans are concerned all amounts were collected accordingly the Documents were also returned to the concerned 17 members for which the particular documents are herewith produced before this court for the appreciation of this case. Unfortunately at the time of surcharge proceedings the documents were not at all available with the petitioner/appellant. The document is very very important to receive this court. Otherwise the petitioner/appellant will be put to irreparable loss. As far as the above two documents are concerned after complying the defects in the 81 equiry as well as the 87 proceedings alone the attachment on the properties of the petitioner's/appellant's family had been lifted, accordingly for the appreciation of the evidence the two documents are filed before the court on the appeal. There is no valid objection on the side of the respondent, with regard to the reception of the documents on the appeal. If the documets are received no serious prejudice would be caused to the respondents. Hence the above petition.

3. The learned counsel for respondent endorsed as 'no counter'.

4. Brief facts of the case is as follows:- (CMA(CS) No. 23/2018)

The appellant in appeal was serving as employee of MD. Spl.33 Periyakulam Co-Operative Housing Society,Ltd. A dispute with regard to diversification of funds of the society by utilizing the collected loan amount for the purpose of payment of salary to the employees of the society including the appellant herein violating the circulars of the Registrar and also violating the byelaws arose. Irregularities were found in diversification of funds of the society. Instead of remitting the loan amounts collected from the members of the society to the Tamilnadu Co.operative housing Federation Chennai, the collected loan amount was diverted and taken as salaries, Earned leave encashment of the employees of the society and thereby caused loss to the society to the tune of Rs.1,51,69,511.89p. Enquiry under section 81 of T.N. Co.op societies Act was ordered on 13.06.2016 in Na.Ka.No.1136/2016 regarding the affairs of the said society in connection with the collection of the loan amount and instead of remitting the same to account of the Tamilnadu co-operative housing federation diverted and taken as salaries, Earned leave encashment of the employees of the society. After completion of enquiry under Section 81 of TNCS Act, the enquiry officer has filed his report on 05.01.2017 by recommending to initiate surcharge proceedings against the employees of the society who have received salary including the appellant herein as they have violated the Circular issued by the Registrar of Co-Operative Society in Na.Ka.No.1954/2012/C3, dated.14.05.2012 and thereby caused a loss to the society. Based on the said report, the 87 proceedings has been initiated and after the enquiry, the respondent has passed the surcharge order against the appellant by stating that, contrary to the said circular the appellant has debited more than 3% of the interest collected for the loans lent to the members of the society as salary and thereby caused loss to the society for which the appellant herein are liable to the society to the extent of excess salary received by them and the amount was ordered to be recovered from the employees of the society including the appellant herein jointly and severally with further interest at 15% per annum.

5. Aggrieved against the Surcharge Order passed by the 1st respondent dated:-16.05.2018 the appellant has preferred this present appeal.

6. **Points for consideration:-**

1. Whether the petition filed in I.A.No.1/2025 to receive the additional documents in the appeal is to be allowed?

2. Whether the Surcharge order passed by the respondent in Tha.Va.No.8/2016-17, dated 16.05.2018 is liable to be set aside?

7. POINT NO.1 (IA.1/2025) :-

This petition is filed to receive additional documents in the appeal on the side of the petitioner/appellant. The petitioner is the appellant in the main appeal and the appeal has been preferred against the Surcharge Order dated.16.05.2018 passed in Tha.Va.No.8/2016-17 by the respondent herein

The petitioner was the Writter of the MD. Spl.33 Periyakulam Co-Operative Housing Society, Ltd. **(hereinafter referred as “Society” for convenience and brevity)**. As per the Surcharge Proceedings, the loss caused to the society was a sum of Rs.1,51,69,511.89p. The allegation against the appellant is that, he along with other employees have violated the circular of the Registrar (Housing) dated.14.05.2012 that only 3% of the amount collected as interest income alone to be utilized for the purpose of salary. But instead of utilizing 3% of the interest collected for the period from 01.04.2008 to 31.03.2016 towards salary, the appellant has utilized an excess sum of Rs.1,51,69,511.89p towards salary without credited into the account of the Tamilnadu Co.operative housing Federation Chennai (**hereinafter referred as “federation” for convenience and brevity**) the appellant along with other employees of the society are responsible. The said amount of Rs.1,51,69,511.89p was termed as loss caused to the society. But the petitioner/appellant herein have been defending the case on the ground that, there was a settlement under Section 18 (1) of Industrial Disputes Act between the Management and employees of the society on 24.09.1999 and the same was approved by the Board and Special officer of the Society and thereafter the appellant has received the salary as per the 18(1) settlement with the consent of the management and as such the difference amount which was received as a salary by them cannot be construed as a loss to the society. The petitioner want to introduce certain additional documents by way of this present petition. The documents sought to be introduced by the petitioner is the Settlement under Section 18(1) of Industrial Disputes Act between the Management and employees. The contention of the petitioner is that the settlement arrived between the management and the Tamilnadu Co-operative housing societies 'Workers sammelanum' and copy of letter dated 18.09.2017 addressed to the Secretary/President of the society stating that all the amount under 17 loans concerned were collected and the documents were returned to the concerned 17 members were though raised by him before the surcharge proceedings, the same were not produced either by the 81 enquiry officer or by the respondent and as such the petitioner want to introduce the copy of the said settlement and the letter dated 18.09.2017 as additional documents. The reason stated by the petitioner is that, he could not produce the documents before the Surcharge Proceedings and the documents sought to be introduced are very much essential to decide the issue in the appeal. So far as the documents sought to be introduced by the petitioner is concerned, the respondent / Management has not raised any objection and in fact they have endorsed as "No counter" to this petition. On perusal of Surcharge

Proceedings, the Settlement under Section 18(1) of Industrial Disputes Act, arrived between the management and employees of the society to revise the salary of the employees has not been produced before the Surcharge Proceedings as there is no reference about the same in the Surcharge order. Since the petitioner is claiming that, there is no loss caused to the society but the amount termed as loss in the Surcharge Proceedings has been received by him only as a salary as per the 18(1) settlement, the settlement under section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, is vital and necessary documents to decide the issue in the appeal. Likewise, the letter dated 18.09.2017 was addressed by the Federation to the society stating that the amount under 17 loans have been collected and the documents were also return to the 17 members. The failure to return the original documents to members despite they repaid the entire loan amount is one among the reason for initiating inquiry under Section 81 in order to ascertain as to what had happened to those documents mortgaged by members and during the inquiry only it was ascertained that the loan amount collected from the members have been utilized for the purpose of giving salary to the employees of the society. Now the Federation itself addressed the letter stating that the documents have been returned to the members as the entire loan amount was collected. The petitioner had no opportunity to produce those documents before the Surcharge Proceedings, and as such the same can be received as additional document for just decision of the appeal. Considering all these facts, I am of the view that the copy of the settlement dated 24.09.1999 under section 18(1) of I.D.Act and the letter dated 18.09.2017 received from Federation which could not be produced by the petitioner before the Surcharge Proceedings, are necessary document which can be received. If the said documents are received as additional evidence no serious prejudice would be caused to the respondents but if the same are not received, the petitioner will be put it to great hardship as he may not be in a position to prove the subsistence of the settlement which is a vital document to prove the case of the petitioner herein as such I am inclined to receive the additional document now produced by the petitioner along with this petition and this point is answered accordingly.

8. <u>C.M.A(CS). No.23/2018:-</u>

This appeal has been preferred against the Surcharge Proceedings of the respondent dated.16.05.2018 passed in Tha.Va.No.8/2016-17. The appellant herein is the 1st respondent before the respondent in the Surcharge Proceedings. The appellant herein had served as a Writter of the society. There was some irregularities regarding diversification of funds of the society by utilizing the collected loan amount for the purpose of payment of salary to the employees of the society including the appellant herein violating the circulars of the Registrar and also violating the byelaws were found during the tenure of the appellant herein in the society and enquiry was ordered with regard to the transaction in the society for the period from 01.04.2005 to 31.03.2016 under Section 81 of Tamil Nadu Co-Operative Societies Act and the Co-operative Sub Registrar (housing) was appointed as a enquiry officer. The said officer conducted enquiry with regard to the alleged irregularities and transaction of the funds of the society for the period from 01.04.2005 to 31.03.2016 and submitted her report dated. 05.01.2017 to the respondent herein recommending to initiate surcharge proceedings against the employees of the society who have received salary. On receipt of the said 81 enquiry report, the respondent had initiated Surcharge Proceedings against the appellant and other employees of the society who have received salary through diversification of the society funds. After conducting an enquiry, the respondent vide his Surcharge Proceedings dated.16.05.2018, passed surcharge order against the appellant and other employees of the society herein holding them jointly and severally liable for the loss caused to the society to the tune of Rs.1,51,69,511.89p and directed them to pay the said amount with further interest which is now under challenge by way of the present appeal.

9. The respondent had held the appellant in appeal herein who is the Writter of the society responsible jointly and severally for the loss caused to the society because of the commissions and omissions. The appellant herein was admittedly served as Writter of the society during the period between 01.04.2005 to 31.03.2016 and the 81 enquiry was also conducted by the enquiry officer with regard to the commissions and omissions during the above said period. The loss caused to the society is though classified under 4 different heads all the four heads are related to a same irregularity in connection with the collection of the loan amount and instead of remitting the same to account of the Tamilnadu co-operative housing federation, diverted and taken as salaries, Earned leave encashment of the employees of the society by violating the circular issued by the Registrar of Co-Operative Society in Na.Ka.No.1954/2012/C3 dated. 14.05.2012 and thereby they caused loss to the respondent society to the tune of Rs.1,51,69,511.89p. On perusal of the said circualr which was said to have been violated by the appellant herein, it is found that the circular is insisting the Management and employees that they must get salary of only 3% of the interest for the loan amount collected from the members of the society. Therefore as per the circular issued by the Registrar (Housing), the total salary drawn by the employees of the society shall not exceed 3% of the total amount of the collection of interest for the loan amount. The 81 enquiry officer has found that, as per the said circular, the employees of the society are entitled to only a sum of Rs.27,62,332.16 towards salary but they have received a sum of Rs.1,79,31,844/- as salary and as such there is a difference of Rs.1,51,69,511.89 which is a excess amount received as a salary which caused loss to the society. According to the 81 enquiry report, all the amount collected as interest for the loan amount less 3%, which could be taken towards salary for employees of the society, ought to have been credited into the account of the Tamil Nadu Co-Operative Housing Federation but instead of doing so, the appellant herein have received 10.5% from the collected interest amount as a salary and thereby they caused loss to the society in respect of the excess 7.5%. The crux of the 81 report is that the salary permissible to the employees of the society as per the circular of the Registrar (Housing) during the relevant period was only a sum of Rs.27,62,332.16, but the actual salary received by the employees during the relevant period was Rs.1,79,31,844/- and the excess amount of Rs.1,51,69,511.89 was a loss caused to the society as the said amount was not credited into the account of the Tamil Nadu Housing Federation.

Therefore the next point for consideration is, whether the salary received by the appellant herein could be construed as a misappropriation or loss caused to the society by the act of the appellant.

10. The appellant is not denying the circular issued by the Registrar of Co-Operative Societies stipulating only 3% of the collection of interest of the loan amount as a salary for the employees of the society but they claims that there was a settlement under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the Management and the employees of the society to revise the salary of the employees on 16.10.1999 and the said settlement under the Industrial Disputes Act was approved by the Board and Special Officer of the society of the society and as such they have received the salary from 01.04.2005 to 31.03.2016 only as per the 18(1) settlement with consent of the Management and as such the receipt of salary by them cannot be termed as a loss caused to the society. The appellant has failed to raise such plea before the Surcharge Proceedings. In view of the order passed in I.A.No.1/2025, it is decided to receive the said settlement under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the Management and the employees of the society to revise the salary. On perusal of the said Additional Document, it is very clear that as per the settlement under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act it was agreed between the

Society and management to increase the pay and other allowances of the employees of the society and procedure to fix the salary of the employes. Further there is a recital found inthe said settlement that the settlement agreement shall remain in force for 5 years from 01.07.1998 to 30.06.2003 and shall continue to remain in force even after its expiry until a new settlement agreement is arrived between the parties. It is not disputed by the respondent that there was a settlement under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act between the Management and employees which paved way for salary hike to the employees but the specific contention in the surcharge order is that the appellant herein has received excess salary in violation of the circular issued by the Registrar. The circular dated 14.05.2012, which relied upon by the respondent for passing the surcharge order by treating the salary received by the appeallants over and above the 3% of the total colllection of interest for loan amount as a loss caused to the society, itself was issued only subsequent to the 18(1) settlement under I.D.Act and its consequential approval by the Board of the society. Therefore the circular should have been issued only after considering all those previous settlements and resolutions. Therefore, the appellant herein has received the salary only as per the settlement under Section 18(1) of Industrial Disputes Act which was approved by the Board. But unmindful of this fact and ignoring the settlement under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, the enquiry officer seems to have submitted the report as if the salary received by the employees in pursuance of the 18(1) settlement dated 16.10.1999 as a loss caused to the society and the accepting the said report, the respondent has also passed the Surcharge order as if the receipt of salary by the appellant pursuant to the aforesaid settlement itself amounts to loss caused to the society.

11. The socities are getting finanacial assistance from the Tamilnadu Co-operative scocieties federation, Chennai by way of borrowing loan for the purpose of lending housing loan to its members for construction of house, renovation of the existing house and house mortgage loan. The mortgage loan would be lent to the members on deposit of their title deeds of their house with the society. The housing societies used to prepare the list of the members seeking loan and sought financial assistance from the federation by enclosing the documents mortgaged by the members and the federation, in turn, would extend financial assistance to the concerned society by way of lending loan and the societies would, in turn, lend loan to its members for a higher rate of interst varying from 1% to 3% more than that of the interest rate for which the society borrowed loan from the federation. The society is expected to utilize the aforesaid excess iterest alone for its administrative expenses and financial management. Through the circular under Na.Ka. No. 1954/2012 dated 29.05.2012 instruction has been issued to the societies that only this 3% of the marginal interest collected by the societies for the loan lent to its members alone have to be utilized to meet the expenses of the employees and the miscellaneous expenses. It appears that this circular has been issued to ensure the prompt repayment of the loan borrowed by the societies from the federation and to redeem the documents deposited by the members then and there and to return the same to them without fail in orderto avoid any possible litigations inititated by the members before court of law seeking return of the documents. No doubt, the amount collected as a interest for the loan lent by the society has to be credited into the account of the federation without any deviation. In the instant case it is stated that though the amount has been collected from the members, instead of remitting the same to the federation, the same has been utilized by the society for the salary expenses and other miscellaneous expenses of the society. It is not the case of the respondent that the interest collected by the society was misappropriated or siphoned by the appellant herein. It is admitted case that they received the said amount only as a salary that too as per the settlement under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The only contention of the respondent is that the appellant herein have received the salary in violation of the circular issued by the Registrar of Co-Operative Societies and received excess payment as a salary. The learned counsel for appellant relied upon a decision of our Hon'ble High Court in ***Tamizhaga Kooturavu Veettu Vasanthi Sangangalin Seyalalargal Association, Madurai Vs. Registrar of Co-Operative Societies (Housing), Madras 2007 (7) MLJ 277*** wherein our Hon'ble Court has very clearly held that, the Registrar of Co-Operative Societies has no jurisdiction to pass an order nullifying the settlement arrived at under section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act and in the said decision our Hon'ble High Court dealt with a case of similar nature and held that once the settlement under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act was entered between the Management and employees to revise the wages and other allowances and the same was acted upon any circular unilaterally reducing wage scales and other benefits of the employees issued by the Registrar is improper. Therefore, in the instant case also such circular issued by the Registrar nullifying the settlement arrived under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act is without jurisdiction and cannot bind the appellant. Without appreciating the said fact, the respondent had passed the Surcharge Order based on the circular issued by the Registrar of Co-Operative societies holding that the appellant is liable by terming the salary received by them as per the 81 settlement of Industrial Disputes Act as a loss caused to the society. There was no misappropriation of the funds by the appellant herein. They have just received the salary as approved by the Management.Further the position of law is well settled that surcharge proceedings can be initiated under section 87 of T.N. Co-op societies Act only if the employee had done an actionable wrong either by ommission or commission in a reprehesible manner with reckless callousness and with a supine indifference , without takng due care and caution ordinarily expected from a reasonable and prudent man. It is also settled law that a mere negligence is not sufficient and it must be with a malfide intention so as to attract section 87 of the said Act. Admittedly in the instant case it is not the case of the respondent that appellant herein has committed any misappropriation, fraudulently retained any money or other property of the society or guilty of breach of trust or caused any deficiency in the assets of the society by breach of trust or willful negligence or the payments were made not in accordance with the said Act, the rules or bye-laws. As already discussed, the Board of Management, as per its resolution, approved the settlement under section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, revising the wages of the employees of the society but according to the respondent it is in violation of the circular of the Registrar. As stated earlier, the respondent, cannot by issuing circular, adjudicate over the settlements as there is a total lack of jurisdiction as held by our Hon'ble high court in catena of decisions. Therefore the circular of the registrar cannot nullify the 18(1) settlement of I.D.Act arrived between the management and the society and proceedings under section 81 or 87 of the T.N. Co-operative Societies Act cannot be initiated for recovery of amount either from the employees or from the persons in management of the society for the payment of excess amount to employees on the basis of 18(1) settlement of I.D.Act. Further as per the letter dated 18.09.2017 addressed to the President / Secretary of the society from the Federation which was ordered to be received as an additional document clearly shows that the entire amount under the 17 loans have been collected and the documents were also returned to the concerned members. Therefore, on that aspect also there was no loss caused to the society as alleged in the Surcharge. Viewing from any angle, the salary received by the appellant as per the settlement under section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act cannot be construed as a loss caused to the society and the circular issued by the Registrar cannot nullify the settlement under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act and the loan amount was also collected by the Federation and the documents were also returned to the members. But without considering all these facts the respondent has passed the Surcharge Proceedings directing the appellant to repay the amount with interest which they received only as a salary and their act of receiving salary had in no way caused loss to the society. Accordingly, I hold that the Surcharge order passed by the respondent is liable to be set aside and this point is answered accordingly.

I.A.No.1/2025:-

In the result, this petition is allowed. No costs.

C.M.A.(CS) No.23/2018:-

In the result, this appeal is allowed without cost by setting aside the Surcharge Order of the respondent dated 16.05.2018 in Tha.Va.No.8/2016-17 against this appellant.

Dictated to the Stenographer, directly typed by her in computer, taken printout, corrected, and pronounced by me in open court, this the 27th day of July, 2026.

This order is uploaded today.

SAISARAVANAN

Digitally signed by SAISARAVANAN
Date: 2026.08.12 17:41:35 +0530

PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE
MADURAI.

Copy to:

The Deputy Registrar (Housing),
Madurai Circle, Madurai.