

---

**(2004) 12 MAD CK 0026**  
**In the Madras High Court**  
**Case No : Writ Petition No. 24403 of 2003**

R. Nanjappan

APPELLANT

Vs

The District Collector and Others

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision :** 29-12-2004

**Acts Referred:**

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 226

**Citation :** (2005) WritLR 47

**Hon'ble Judges :** Markandey Katju, C.J.;N.V. Balasubramanian, J

**Bench :** Division Bench

**Advocate :** C.R. Prasannan, for the Appellant; V. Raghupathy, Government Pleader and P.M. Duraisamy, (R5), for the Respondent

**Final Decision :** Dismissed

---

## Judgement

Markandey Katju, C.J.—By this Public Interest Litigation, the petitioner challenges the shifting of the Village Administrative Office from one village to another.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner. In our opinion, this writ petition is to be rejected in limine. It is well-settled that writ jurisdiction is

discretionary jurisdiction. Even if there is violation of any law, we are not bound to exercise our discretion under Article 226 of the Constitution. In

J.R. Raghupathy and Others Vs. State of A.P. and Others, , the Supreme Court observed that interference by the High Court in exercise of its"

jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution in the Government's decision regarding the location of Mandal Headquarters on the ground of

breach of guidelines is not warranted. In Chandra Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan and Another, it was held that the writ jurisdiction is discretionary

jurisdiction. Similar view was taken in Mafatlal Industries Ltd. and Others Vs.

Union of India (UOI) and Others, . Moreover, petitioner has not been able to show any of his rights has been violated or infringed by shifting the Village Administrative Office. This is not a fit case, in our opinion, for exercise of our discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution. The writ petition is, therefore, dismissed. Connected WPMP No. 30045 of 2003 is closed.