

**BEFORE THE COMMISSIONER, H.R. & C.E.ADMN.DEPARTMENT, CHENNAI-34.**

Monday the 29<sup>th</sup> day of May, Two thousand and Seventeen.

Present: Dr.M.Veera Shanmugha Moni,  
Commissioner.

**A.P.No.18/2009 D2**

**Between**

K.Shanmugavel Mudaliyar

...Appellant

**And**

1. The Joint Commissioner,  
H.R.&C.E. Admn. Department,  
Chennai-34.
2. The Fit Person/Executive Officer,  
Arulmighu Karaneeswarar Temple,  
Saidapet, Chennai. 15.
3. The Executive Officer, Arulmighu Ranganathaperumal  
Temple,  
Thiruneermalai, Chennai 600 044.
4. M. Aruleesan,
5. Tmt. S. Varalakshmi
6. Tmt. Sundari
7. Tmt. M. Gnanasundari,
8. Tmt. R. Ambika
9. Tmt. V. Padmavathi,
10. M. Sarveswaran

... Respondents

In the matter of Arulmighu Agastheeswarar Temples, Pozhichalur, Chennai 600  
074.

The Appeal Petition filed under Section 53(5) of the Tamil Nadu H.R.& C.E. Act 1959 (Tamil Nadu Act 22 of 1959) against the order dated 27.02.2009 and 14.3.2009 in Pro.Rc.No.2741/2003 A1 of the Joint Commissioner, H.R. &C.E. Admn. Department, Chennai.

**Order in R.Dis. A.P.No.18/2009 D2 dated: 29.05.2017**

The above appeal petition came up for final hearing before me on 25.04.2017 in the presence of the Thiru.P.K.Ganesh, counsel for the appellant M/s.A.S.Kailasam & Associates counsel for the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, M/s.T.S.Vijayaraghavan, counsel for the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent and Thiru.W.C.Thiruvengadam, counsel for the 4 to 10 respondents and perused the relevant records. Upon hearing their arguments and having perused the connected records and the matter having stood over for consideration till this day, the following order is passed:-

**ORDER**

The above appeal petition was filed u/s.53(5) of the Act against the order dated 27.02.2009 and 14.03.2009 in Pro.Rc.No.2741/2003 of the Joint Commissioner, Chennai in ordering the removal of the appellant herein from Hereditary Trustee and appointing Fit person to the temple.

2. The appellant has stated that the temples are private, The idols are installed in (village site) residential Grama Natham lands in Survey No.210/2, not temple site or any other village promboke the place where the idols in question is kept is a residential place house site in Grammantham which have not been considered as place of public religious worship. The Institutions and the Endowment are exempted and are not covered under the definition under section 6 (17) and 6 (20) of the Tamil Nadu Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act. In 1972, H.R.&C.E Dept. attempted to interfere with the administration of Sri Agastheeswarar Temple by appointing an Executive Officer. The Order was challenged in R.C. 169/1972. O.A. No.100/1972 was preferred on the file of the Deputy Commissioner, H.R. & C.E. under Section 63 (b) and Order dated 24.09.1973 came to be passed in the said O.A. declaring that the Office of the Trusteeship of the Temple was held hereditarily, but not declared defined in the act. In the meanwhile, by Order dated 28.02.1991, the commissioner appointed an Executive Officer for Arulmigu Agastheeswarar Temple without notice. Subsequently, by proceedings dated 23.12.1991 the commissioner added sri Agastheeswarar temple along with Thiruneermalai Ranganathaswamy temple group and directed the Executive officer of the said temple to take over the entire charge of sri Agastheeswarar temple. The said order was also made without notice or copy of the order to hereditary trustee. Acting under the said order, the Executive officer of Ranganathawamy temple claimed to act as the fit person as will be evident from the records of the respondents. It will thus be seen that the earlier order dated 28.02.1991 appointing an Executive officer had worked itself out. The status of hereditary trustee was confirmed by the orders of the Hon'ble High Court, Madras in Writ Petition No. 2341 of 1999 order dated 15.4.1999 & 6.9.1999.and W.P.No.8162/2000 & W.P.No.8286/2000. Right from the date he has been continuing to maintain and manage the temple in his capacity of Sole Managing Hereditary Trustee. The Hereditary trustee owns property in Pozhichalur village, Alandur Taluk and Kancheepuram District is a Village site GramaNatham land the idols kept and maintained by him and the

predecessors' in the property owned by them i.e. also in GramaNatham land survey No.210/2. The jurisdiction of the HR & CE Act comes in to play only when the property or idols kept in the village promboke or Temple site. There by the temple situate is not in the place as a place of public religious worship as provided under the provisions of the act. It is the residential property village site of appellant. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent had issued an order dated 03.05.2000 appointing the Executive Officer as a Fit Person ignoring petitioner as hereditary trustee as appellant not fit to hold the post based on the orders of the commissioner dated 18-04-2000. Both were challenged by appellant challenging the validity of both the order. Writ Petition No.8162 of 2000 and W.P.8286 of 2000 was filed and both were disposed of in favor of appellant, based on the orders issued, appointment of fit person was withdrawn by order dt.19-01-2001 and 1<sup>st</sup> respondent also directed appellant to operate the bank accounts, income & expenditure. Thereafter W.P.8286 of 2000 was dismissed with observation that the same has become infructuous. Subsequently the orders issued terminating appellant was withdrawn. Writ Petition No.8162 of 2000 order was passed giving liberty to appellant to seek relief before appropriate forum in the event of appointment of fit person in future is made. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent did not verify as to the earlier orders in W.P.8286 of 2000 & Writ Petitions No.8162 of 2000, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent has passed an order dated 23-06-2003 by framing the charges against appellant, suspending appellant from the management, appointing the executive officer to hold the office of (fit person), assigning the reason that appellant did not chose to obtain permission from the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent as the temple is coming under the purview of H.R & CE Act. After passing orders in the earlier Writ petitions, Hon'ble High Court condemned the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent as to passing an order on the same subject on admission, directed the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent to be present in court gave an undertaking as the order dated 23-06-2003 would be withdrawn. The W.P.No.18185 of 2003 was disposed of with the observation after giving an undertaking given by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent. In all proceeding it was not held that the temple is coming under the purview of the act. Again the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent had again interfered with the administration of the temple by issuing a show cause notice by his letters dated 22-04-03, and 24-11-03. All the notices were replied by letter dated 11.8.2008 & 12.1.2004 by appellant as the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent have no jurisdictions to question the validity of the activities of appellant or the temple. There by

the above proceedings were disposed of and pending based on the reply. The appellant sent several complaints to commissioner by (RPAD) stating allegation against the respondents till date no action was taken, when appellant called upon the officers to give him accounts relating to their, they have not done so and to cover up their mismanagement, misfeasance their powers, false charges are leveled against the appellant. The Patta issued in the name of the previous Hereditary trustee was revoked by the Tasildar under UDR Scheme. On coming to know as to the changes of Patta, appellant challenged the same. The enquiry was conducted by the Thasildar confirmed the order passed under UDR. Aggrieved by the orders an appeal was preferred before the sub- collector in Proceedings Rc.No.64046/2007/6 dated 08-02-08 finally orders were passed rejecting the claim of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and confirmed the earlier orders of settlement officer ordered for issue of Patta in the name of appellant. Such appellant by his letter dated 2.6.2004, represented to the commissioner seeking for No Objection Certificate for sale and lease of property covered under private endowment as per G.O. No. 150 of 2000. The said representation dated 2.6.2004 was rejected by passing an order dated 25.10.2004 expressing that the same could not be granted in pursuance of the decision taken by the Government as a policy matter. The said order was passed on the impression that the properties of the private endowment are the properties of the temple, ignoring the orders passed in the court of the Settlement officer, Chengulpet dated 6.1.1969 within the meaning of under section 8(1) of the T.N. Minor Inam abolition Act 30/1963. The said order was passed by the commissioner without considering as to the nature of the property as a Grama natham land village site of an extent of 6 acres as private property. The temple was constructed within the Gramanatham land village site. Thereby the question of identity of the property cannot be called as temple land. The endowment within the meaning of H.R.&C.E Act under section 6(17) & 6(19) would not attract. The temples as well as the land adjoining to the temple are private property. Wherein appellant also resides within the boundaries of the property covered under natham land. Thereby the order of the commissioner is not proper without consideration of the proper records in the village office and also the records furnished by appellant in support of his claim. The said representation was disposed off by the Hon'ble High Court in a W.P.No. 36041 of 2004 on 24.11.2004, by granting liberty to him to approach the

Government under Section 114(4) of H.R. & C.E. Act for appropriate relief. Based on the observation by the Hon'ble High Court Madras, Revision petition was filed before the Government on 20.1.2005. Pending disposal of the revision petition before the Government questioning the jurisdiction of the HR & CE Act, the 1st respondent has passed an order dated 07-12-05 by framing the charges against appellant suspending appellant from the administration of the temple and appointed fit Person 5<sup>th</sup> time. The order of suspension was challenged by me on the file of the Hon'ble High Court by filing Writ Petition No. 39182 of 2005 and proceedings were stayed by the Hon'ble High Court by order dated 13.12.2005 in W.M.P.42683 of 2005 in W.P.39812 of 2005. On considering 1<sup>st</sup> respondent counter the Hon'ble High Court had passed an order dt.11-02-08 with an observation as the stay granted will not preclude the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent from conducting an enquiry or passing final orders. Based on the orders made by the Hon'ble High Court, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent has made an attempt to proceed for enquiry. To avoid harassment by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent appellant had filed Writ Appeal No. 486 of 2008 order dated 24.4.2008 and in the said writ appeal the Division Bench of the Hon'ble High Court has directed the Government to dispose of the Revision Petition filed by me within 3 months from the date of passing of the order and further directed the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent not to conduct enquiry till the revision petition filed by appellant before the Government is disposed off. After passing of the orders in Writ Appeal No. 486 of 2008 the Revision Petition was taken up for consideration and disposed off hurriedly without providing sufficient and proper opportunity to appellant. The orders were passed on 7.11.2008 by the Government Orders passed by the Secretary is not proper and had exceeded jurisdiction. The government did not choose to exercise his jurisdiction in deciding the matters within the powers and scope of revision. He has exceeded his limits in deciding as to the ownership of the property instead of deciding the issue raised by appellant, in the revision petition. Thereby the Revision Petition was disposed by the Order dated 07.11.2008 confirming order dated 25.10.2004. It is not proper and valid in law. The appellant filed W.P.No.28398/2008 against the said order and was later advised to withdraw writ petition as the matter involves investigation of facts and law which may not be possible under article 226 of constitution of India thereafter appellant filed O.A. before the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent under section 63(a) &63(c) of the act, which was also summarily

rejected by the same before the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent without any enquiry dated 18-2-2009 and his Appeal petition under section 69(1) in A.P.No.4/2009 and A.P.No.5/2009 before the Commissioner and suit before the DMC Alandur in O.S.No.118/2009 challenging order of the Government are pending. Ever since 2003 the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent has been framing untenable charges against the appellant from time to time and made attempts to suspend appellant and all these proceedings were challenged by appellant in Hon'ble High court and all these proceedings are referred to by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent in his proceedings dated 27.2.2009. The question of jurisdiction is the subject matter of A.P.No.4/09 & A.P.No5/09 on the file of the commissioner and O.S.No.118/09 on the file of DMC Alandur. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent statutory officer cannot revise his own order because such action besides involving gilbertain paradox is also opposed to principles of natural justice. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent ought to have held a regular enquiry showing appellant the evidence against appellant and giving appellant an opportunity to disprove the charges under section 53(3) of the act. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent ought to have seen that question of jurisdiction was raised before the High court in earlier proceedings and in W.P.34061/2004 & W.P.No.39812/2005 and same was challenged in W.A.No.486/2008 the Hon'ble High court granted the stay of the enquiry initiated by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent against the petitioner pending till the government decide the revision petition filed under section 114 of the act and order of the Government is under challenge in DMC. Alandur by suit in O.S.No.118/2009 and the same is pending.

3. I heard Thiru.P.K.Ganesh, counsel for the appellant, M/s. A.S.Kailasam & Associate, counsel for the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent, M/s.T.S.Vijayaraghavan, counsel for the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent and Thiru.W.C.Thiruvengadam, counsel for the 4 to 10 respondents and perused the relevant records.

4. In the order dated 11.01.2017 made in W.A.No.1161/2009 the Hon'ble High Court has order as follows:-

***“We are informed that the appeal is still pending and has not been decided as per the impugned order in view of the stay order granted by this court on the ground that the officer concerned delaying with the matter would be hearing it. This grievance does not survive on account of the passage of***

***time as the officer is changed and thus, we direct that the appeal be disposed of within a maximum period of two months from the day”.***

Accordingly, notice of enquiry was issued to the parties concerned and enquiry was held on 14.03.2017, 28.03.2017 and 11.04.2017 in A.P.No.18/2009. After hearing the both sides the said A.P.No.18/2009 was reserved for orders. At that time it was brought to the knowledge of this forum that by order dated 08.04.2009 in W.A.No.398/2009 the Hon'ble High Court has ordered to hear the said appeals along with the two appeal pending. Hence, the said appeal petition was reopened and posted along with A.P.No.4 and 5/2009, for hearing on 25.04.2017.

5. Pursuant to the direction of the Hon'ble High court, the matter was posted for hearing on 14.03.2017, 28.03.2017, 11.04.2017 and finally on 25.04.2017. But every time the appellant sought time for engaging counsel, for amendment of petition and citing the order passed by the civil court in O.S.No.118/2009 by filing memo. He had also requested certified copies of the all the documents filed in the A.P.18/2009. The appellant adapted all dilatory tactics to drag on the proceedings.

6. Against the order dated 11.01.2017 passed by the Hon'ble High court in W.A.No.1161/2009, the appellant had filed Special Leave Petition before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP(C) 9075/2017. In the Writ Appeal, the appellant had filed all the documents which were filed in A.P.No.18/2009. The same set of documents have been filed in the Special Leave Petition. Further in the W.A.No.1161/2009, the same counsel was engaged by the appellant. When the appellant was able to get the case bundle in W.A.No.1161/2009, it is illogical to state that he was not able to get the case bundle in A.P.No.18/2009 from his counsel. Though appellant has filed copy application to provide certified copies of the documents filed in the A.P.No.18/2009, he failed to furnish stamp papers as called for by the office.

7. Further, in the Special Leave Petition, Hon'ble Supreme Court has denied to grant interim stay. Further, the respondents were impleaded by order dated 07.08.2009, but stay was granted by the Hon'ble High Court on 10.09.2009. In the interregnum, the appellant did not take any steps to amend the petition. Further, the case was adjourned to several times, but the appellant was not interested in filing the

amended petition. As the said amendment can be carried out by the registry itself, it was not a valid ground for seeking adjournment.

8. Further in the memo filed by the appellant, he has prayed time on the following grounds:-

(i) By virtue of the decree in O.S.No.118/2009 the order of removal of Hereditary Trustee by the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent order dated 27.02.2009 and 14.03.2009 became null and void.

(ii) In the said suit it was held that the grama natham lands do not come under the purview of the HR&CE Act.

(iii) The appeal filed against the order of the Hon'ble Supreme of Court of India in SLP(N)9075/2017 is pending.

9. The decree passed in O.S.No.118/2009 was an ex parte order. Regarding the said order CRP.No.1123/2013 is pending before the Hon'ble High Court. Further the said suit was filed by the petitioner praying for declaration that

1) The plaintiffs temples situated in residential place Grama Natham(Village site) in Survey No.210/2 private land properties are not coming under the purview of the HR&CE Act.

2) For permanent injunction restraining the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant and their subordinates or any one claiming through or under them either from conducting any enquiry initiated by the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant against the plaintiff unless and until the character of institution is decided.

3) The defendants cannot exercise a jurisdiction provision of HR&CE Act and for permanent injunction restraining the defendants or their men or agents or servants or any other persons from in any way interfering with the management and administration of Arulmigu Agastheeswarar Temple and allied Temples of the plaintiff as Managing Hereditary trustee.

4) For permanent injunction restraining the defendants or their men or agents or servants subordinates or any other persons from in any way interfering in any way restricting or controlling the plaintiff in dealing his Grama Natham properties and personal properties as Hereditary Trustee.

In the said suit it was ordered as follows:

(i) It is declared that the plaintiffs temples situated in residential place Grama Natham (Village Site) in Survey No.210/2 private land properties are not coming under the purview of the HR&CE Act.

(ii) That the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant and their subordinates or any one claiming through or under them are hereby restrained by means of permanent injunction from conducting any enquiry initiated by the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant against the plaintiff unless and until the character of institution is decided , the defendants cannot exercise jurisdiction under the provision of HR&CE Act.

(iii) That the defendants or their men or agents or servants subordinates or any other persons are hereby restrained by means of permanent injunction from in any way interfering with the management and administration of Arulmigu Agastheeswarar Temple and allied Temples of the Plaintiff as Managing Hereditary Trustee.

(iv) That the defendants or their men or agents or servants subordinates or any other persons are hereby restrained by means of permanent injunction from in any way interfering in any way restricting or controlling the plaintiff in dealing his Grama Natham properties and personal properties as Hereditary Trustee.

(v) That the both parties do bear their own cost.

10. In the said order only the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant/Joint Commissioner and his subordinate were restrained to conduct any enquiry. But the Commissioner is not a subordinate to the 3<sup>rd</sup> defendant/Joint Commissioner. Hence the said decree will not restrain this forum to conduct enquiry in the appeal petition. Further, the Hon'ble High Court has directed to dispose of the appeal petition within 2 months. In the Writ Appeal, the appellant had appeared through his counsel and Hon'ble High court has passed the order after hearing the counsel for the appellant. So nothing prevented the appellant to inform the Hon'ble High Court about the decree made in O.S.No.118/2009.

11. Further, the appeal petition was filed by the appellant against the order passed by the Joint Commissioner, Chennai. The O.S.No.118/2009 was not filed against the said order. If the order passed in O.S.No.118/2009 is valid, there is no need for the appellant to file Special Leave Petition against the order passed by the Hon'ble High Court in W.A.No.1161/2009. If the department officers were restrained

to interfere with the management of the appellant, there is also no need to seek time in the appeal petition. Instead, he can very well withdraw the appeal petition. Further, in the Special Leave Petition no stay was granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India .

12. The appellant claims that the lands are Grama Natham not vested with the Government and are private properties of the appellant. In the O.S.No.118/2009 it was declared that temple situated in residential place Grama Natham in S.No.210/2 is private property is not coming under the purview of the HR&CE Act. The origin of the temple is not known. The temple was not established or founded by the appellant's ancestors. The temple was founded by the Chola kings in the said land. The said land was never in the occupation of the appellant's predecessors.

13. In the Judgemnet reported in 2011(5) LW 545, the Hon'ble High Court of Madras has observed as follows:- ***“ Therefore , Gramanatham is not vested with the Government. Under UDR scheme (Up Dating Revenue Record Scheme) the gramanatham lands were surveyed and survey numbers have been assigned. There was an attempt by the Government to levy tax (Natham Nilavari Thittam). Therefore, under that scheme, the Natham lands were surveyed and resurvey numbers were assigned and pattas were issued. Since Gramanatham is the habitation where the land owners may build house sites. They were classified as Gramanatham to differentiate the land from Inam Lands Ryotwari lands, pannai lands and waste lands. While the lands under the other classifications vested with the Government, the gramanatham never vested with the State. However under the UDR Scheme, to enforce a tax on the Natham lands, a Thoraya Patta, for tax purpose was issued to those persons who claimed to be the land holders. The land holding is based on the title through the predecessor-in-title. Therefore, the patta issued under UDR scheme is not the patta under the Land Encroachment Act and there is no bar of the jurisdiction of the Civil Court under Section 14 of the Land Encroachment Act”.***

Accordingly the temple has title over the property and lands are possessed by the temple. The appellant can manage the property as a Hereditary Trustee, but cannot claim ownership of the property. It is admitted by the petitioner that he had

mortgaged the property in favour of his **Sister** and executed Power of Attorney in favour of one V.Vinoth Kumar to create documents to claim that the properties are of his own.

14. As per Sec 28 of the Act, ***“Subject to the provisions of the [Tamil Nadu] Temple Entry Authorisation Act, 1947 (1[Tamil Nadu]Act V of 1947), the trustee of every religious institution is bound to administer its affairs and to apply its funds and properties in accordance with the terms of the trust, the usage of the institution and all lawful directions which a competent authority may issue in respect thereof and as carefully as a man of ordinary prudence would deal with such affairs, funds and properties if they were his own”.***

15. The appellant had failed to lease out the properties in public auction by fixing fair rent as per the provisions of the Act. He miserably failed to protect the properties of the temple. On the other hand, he is trying to establish that the properties are his private properties. He had filed numerous cases against the HR&CE department, Revenue Department and Police Department suppressing several facts. He is abusing the process of law. There is not even a scrap of evidence to prove that the Grama Natham lands belong to the appellant. He used to get orders from the courts by suppressing various material facts. Instead of managing affairs, funds and properties of the temple, he is claiming it as his own property.

16. The appellant is always misinterpreting the Act provision to suit his case. When his predecessors had obtained order u/s.63(b) of the Act and the appellant obtained order u/s.54(1) of the Act, the contention of the petitioner now, that the other provisions of the Act are not applicable to the temple is not acceptable and is highly condemnable. The appellant misused his position for his personal gains. He is trying to convert the public temple into his own property by restricting the public entry and is also using the temple to earn money.

17. ***In the Judgment reported in (2007) 7 Sec 482, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has held that “ The properties of deities, temples and Devaswom Boards, require to be protected and safeguarded by their trustees/ archakas/ shebaites/employees. Instances are many where persons entrusted with the duty of managing and***

***safeguarding the properties of temples, deities and Devaswom Boards have usurped and misappropriated such properties by setting up false claims of ownership or tenancy, or adverse possession. This is possible only with the passive or active collusion of the authorities concerned. Such acts of “ fences eating the crops” should be dealt with sternly. The Government, members or trustees of boards/trusts, and devotees should be vigilant to prevent any such usurpation or encroachment. It is also the duty of courts to protect and safeguard the properties of religious and charitable institutions from wrongful claims or misappropriation”***

It is duty of this forum to safeguard the temple and its properties from getting usurped by fraudulent means. The Joint Commissioner, Chennai has also initiated action u/s.53 of the Act against the appellant to protect the temple and its properties from the hands of the appellant.

Therefore, I find no reason to interfere with the order passed by the Joint Commissioner, Chennai and it does not warrant any interference. Accordingly the order dated 27.02.2009 of the Joint Commissioner, Chennai is hereby confirmed and the appeal petition is dismissed as devoid of merit. The order passed in this appeal petition is subject to the result of the SLP.(C).9075/2017 pending before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

/typed to dictation/

Sd./- M.Veera Shanmugha Moni  
Commissioner

/t.c.f.b.o./

Superintendent

**To:**

1. The appellant through Thiru.P.K.Ganesh, Advocate, No.257, New Additional Law Chambers, High Court Buildings, Chennai-104.
2. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent through M/s.A.S.Kailasam & Associates, Advocate, No.86, Law Chambers, High Court Building, Chennai 600 104.
3. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent through M/s.T.S.Vijaya Raghavan,

Advocate, Brindavanam, Old No.6, New No.9, 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Nanganallur, Chennai -600 061.

4. The Respondents 4 to 10 through Thiru W.C.Thiruvengadam, Advocate, 23, Bagavantham Street, T.Nagar, Chennai 600 01

**Copy to:**

5.The Joint Commissioner, H.R.&C.E. Department, Chennai.34

6.The Assistant Commissioner, H.R.&C.E. Department, Chennai.34.

7. The Inspector, H.R. &C.E. Department, Circle VII, Chennai.

8. 'D3' Section at Head Office (through Numbering)

9. Extra.