

Madras High Court

R. Sharavanan vs The Transport Commissioner on 5 July, 2012

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 5-7-2012

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.PAUL VASANTHAKUMAR

Writ Petition No.9812 of 2012

M.P.No.1 of 2012

R. Sharavanan .. Petitioner

Vs.

The Transport Commissioner,  
Transport Department,  
Chepauk,  
Chennai 600 005.

.. Respondent

Prayer: This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying that

For Petitioner : Mr. K. Raja

For Respondents : Mr. V. Subbiah,  
Special Government Pleader

O R D E R

The prayer in the writ petition is to issue a writ of mandamus directing the respondent to appoint the petitioner as Motor Vehicle Inspector Grade-II forthwith in the vacancy meant and reserved for physically disabled persons.

2. The brief facts necessary for disposal of the writ petition are as follows:

(a) The Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission (TNPSC) issued an advertisement on 24.2.2009 calling for applications for direct recruitment to the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Grade-II, which post comes under the Tamil Nadu Transport Subordinate Services for the vacancies of the years 2006-2008. The advertisement states that those physically handicapped persons i.e., Ortho, Blind and Deaf are also eligible to apply for the said post under 3% posts reserved for physically disabled persons.

(b) The qualifications prescribed as per the advertisement issued on 24.2.2009 are,

(i) Minimum General Educational Qualification;

(ii) A Diploma in Automobile Engineering (3 years course) or Diploma in Mechanical Engineering (3 years course) awarded by the State Board of Technical Educational Training of Tamil Nadu;

(iii) One year experience certificate both on vehicles fitted with petrol engines and vehicles fitted with diesel engines on a full time basis in an automobile workshop, which undertakes repairs of light motor vehicles, heavy goods vehicles and heavy passenger motor vehicles;

(iv) Driving License to drive motor cycle, heavy goods vehicles and heavy passenger motor vehicles;

(v) Experience certificate in driving heavy transport vehicles for a period of six months.

(c) As the petitioner possesses all the required qualifications, he applied for the said post along with certificates, together with disability certificate. After scrutiny of the application and certificates enclosed, petitioner was permitted to appear for the written test and the petitioner came out successfully. Then the petitioner was called for to attend oral test by the TNPSC and at that time he was directed to produce fresh certificate from the Medical Board, specifying the nature of physical disability and degree of disability and also certifying that the physical handicap would not render the petitioner incapable of efficiently discharging the duties of Motor Vehicle Inspector Grade-II. Accordingly petitioner produced fresh certificate from the Medical Board certifying that his physical disability will not hamper his efficient discharge of duties. Petitioner came out successful in the oral test and after taking into consideration the fitness certificate produced, he was provisionally selected for appointment by direct recruitment to the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II by the TNPSC.

(d) In the provisional selection order dated 11.4.2011 it is stated that the petitioner has to wait for further communication from the appointing authority. The appointing authority, the respondent herein by his proceedings dated 28.5.2011 advised the Medical Board to examine the petitioner to find out whether the petitioner is fit to perform the duties of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II. The Medical Board opined that the petitioner is fit to perform the duties of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II.

(e) After the said medical examination, without issuing orders of appointment to the petitioner, again on 21.6.2011 the respondent directed the petitioner to appear before the Committee for assessment of petitioner's working capacity. Petitioner also appeared for assessment. Even thereafter no order of appointment was issued, which resulted in submitting representations on 18.8.2011 and 17.2.2012 to the respondent with a request to issue the appointment order. No order having been passed petitioner has filed this writ petition with the above said prayer.

(f) The contentions raised in the writ petition are that the respondent has not filled up one post reserved for physically handicapped persons, even though 3% quota is provided under the notification; that the petitioner gained driving experience in 1994 itself and he was permitted by the Licensing Authority to be a Driving Instructor and till date he is performing the duties of Driving Instructor; that as an instructor, he is driving all the vehicles while imparting training to the Learners; that the action of the respondent in not giving appointment order in spite of his provisional selection by the TNPSC is contrary to the mandate of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995 (Central Act 1 of 1996), which is a beneficial legislation; and that, all other selected candidates have been issued with appointment order and petitioner alone is discriminated by the respondent by not issuing the appointment order.

3. Respondent has filed counter affidavit contending as follows:

(i) After selection, the Medical Superintendent of the Government Mohan Kumaramangalam Medical College and Hospital, Salem, was addressed with a request to examine the petitioner for giving opinion as to whether the petitioner is fit to perform the duties of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II and after examination the said officer informed that the petitioner is physically handicapped and having 42% of disability in the right upper limb due to post traumatic stiffness of right shoulder with mild restriction of movement of right wrist and he is physically fit to perform the duties of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II and also informed that the working capacity of the petitioner as Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-I has to be assessed personally by the Transport authorities.

(ii) In order to assess the working capacity of the petitioner, a Committee consisting of the Deputy Transport Commissioner, Salem; the Regional Transport Officer, Salem East; and the Automobile Engineer, Motor Vehicles Maintenance Department, Salem, has been formed. The members of the Committee met the Chairman of the Medical Board and discussed the matter in detail. The Chairman of the Medical Board shown the X-Ray copies, from which it was evident that petitioner's right arm has been fitted with a metal plate from the right hand shoulder, which amounts to 42% disability and there is no provision under the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 or Rules, 1989 to hold a driving licence to drive the vehicle by a differently abled person.

(iii) Based on the said discussion the Committee assessed the working capacity of the petitioner and submitted a report to the respondent on 9.7.2011 stating that the petitioner is not eligible to drive the Transport vehicle and the Committee recommended that the petitioner is not fit to perform the duties of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II and the Committee's report was sent to TNPSC for taking further action and the reply of the TNPSC is still awaited.

(iv) For the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-I and II, physical ability is the foremost fitness as the post involves sensitive duties such as selecting the candidates after conducting driving test for issuing driving licence and the officials have to check all parts of the vehicles intensively to issue fitness certificate, including vehicles involved in the accident. As per Rule 5 of the Tamil Nadu Transport Subordinate Service, petitioner being a disabled person, he is not eligible to have driving licence, except for driving invalid carriages (i.e.) to drive retro fitment vehicles as per the specification issued by the Central Government and the non-transport four wheeler manufactured and designed exclusively for physically disable persons. According to the respondent, as the petitioner is not fit to perform the duties of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II, the respondent has prayed for dismissing the writ petition.

4. Mr.K.Raja, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner argued that the petitioner was initially issued with driving licence on 16.6.1994 by the Assistant Licensing Authority, Athur, Salem District, and it was renewed periodically and he is performing the duties as Instructor in a Driving School and the same is evident from the Certificate issued by the Licensing Authority, Salem, to a Driving School bearing Licence No.9/Salem/1998, in which petitioner's name is referred as 'Second Instructor' of the said Driving School. The renewal of driving school licence was granted in the year 2003, wherein also petitioner's name is mentioned as 'Second Instructor'. Subsequent renewal order dated 29.7.2008 also contains the name of the petitioner as the Second Instructor and the driving school licence is valid upto 7.10.2013. The learned counsel further submitted that the State Government has reserved 3% of posts of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II to physically challenged persons, bearing in mind the mandatory duty cast upon the Government to reserve 3% posts in terms of Section 32 and 33 of Act 1 of 1996. The TNPSC invited applications through Advertisement No.187 dated 24.2.2009 by direct recruitment for the vacancies of the years 2006-2008 upto 31.3.2009 for 65 vacancies. The vacancies being 65, only one post is reserved for physically challenged persons. It is also stated in the notification that physically handicapped persons i.e., ortho, blind and deaf are eligible for 3% posts intended for the physically handicapped persons. The petitioner being an orthopaedically challenged person, applied for the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II and appeared in the written test and scored 193.50 marks. He was called upon to attend oral test in which he was awarded 30 marks and in toto, he was awarded 223.50 marks. The petitioner was provisionally selected as Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II by the order of the TNPSC dated 11.4.2011. The posting order is to be issued by the respondent and the respondent directed the petitioner to appear before the Medical Superintendent of the Government Mohan Kumaramangalam Medical College and Hospital, Salem to assess the medical fitness. Accordingly petitioner appeared and it is admitted in the counter affidavit that the said Medical Board found that the petitioner is physically fit to perform the duties of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II.

5. The learned counsel further submitted that the Government of Tamil Nadu having reserved 3% posts of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II to the physically challenged persons, that too under the three categories viz., Ortho, Blind and Deaf, the respondents herein cannot decline the request of the petitioner in issuing appointment/posting order even after he was selected by the TNPSC, on the alleged ground that the petitioner may not be in a position to drive the vehicle and discharge the official duties of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II. The learned counsel further argued that the post being reserved for Ortho, Blind and Deaf candidates, the Government was aware of the fact that the

candidates suffering from blindness, etc., will not be in a position to drive motor vehicles and they cannot perform their duties similar to healthy persons. The Act having been framed by the Central Government and the State Government having taken a decision to implement the reservation to the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II, the respondent is not justified in contending that the petitioner may not be able to drive the vehicle and perform his duties as Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II. Even assuming that the petitioner is not able to perform his duties as a normal person, petitioner's service can be utilised in the office, without giving any field work. The learned counsel cited various decisions in support of his contentions.

6. Mr.V.Subbiah, learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent placing reliance on the counter affidavit filed by the respondent submitted that due to 42% disability in the right upper arm, the petitioner may not be in a position to assess the ability of persons, seeking issuance of driving licence to test the vehicles to issue Fitness Certificate and he will not be in a position to exercise the duties of a driver in terms of Rule 37 of the Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicle Rules, 1989 as driving licence is a requirement under the statutory rule. Even though the petitioner was selected by the TNPSC, he can be given appointment only on the basis of the medical report and therefore the petitioner was not issued with the appointment order.

7. I have considered the rival submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the respondent.

8. The petitioner was issued with driving licence to drive Motor Cycle with gear and LMV on 16.6.1994 and he got licence to drive Heavy Transport Vehicles on 4.9.1995, by the Assistant Licensing Authority, Athur, Salem District, which is being periodically renewed upto 19.10.2012. The petitioner was given training by the Ashok Leyland Driving Training Centre for Driving School Instructors and a certificate to that effect was issued on 22.11.2002. Petitioner is continuously granted approval as 'Second Instructor' in a driving school and the said licence is also renewed upto 7.10.2013.

9. TNPSC invited applications for filling up 65 posts of Motor Vehicle Inspectors Gr-II through Advertisement No.187 dated 24.2.2009. In the said advertisement 3% of posts are reserved for physically handicapped persons i.e., Ortho, Blind and Deaf. In the advertisement it is specifically stated that the physically handicapped persons should produce a certificate of physical fitness from the Medical Board to the effect that his/her handicap will not render him/her incapable of efficiently discharging the duties attached to the post to which he/she has been selected. Petitioner submitted application along with all certificates including driving licence to drive motor cycle, heavy goods vehicles and heavy passenger motor vehicles and driving experience certificate, apart from experience and educational certificates. Petitioner also produced the certificate dated 30.9.2010 issued by the Medical Board, specifying the nature of physical handicap mentioning the degree of disability, certifying that his physical handicap would not render him incapable of efficiently discharging his duties of the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II in the Tamil Nadu Transport Subordinate Service.

10. Petitioner appeared in the written test and secured 193.50 marks and was called for oral test in which he was awarded 30 marks, thus in toto, petitioner was awarded 223.50 marks. Based on the said marks secured, petitioner was provisionally selected by the TNPSC to the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II by order dated 11.4.2011.

11. The respondent herein by communication dated 28.4.2011 directed the Medical Superintendent, Government Mohan Kumaramangalam Medical College and Hospital to examine the petitioner and give his opinion as to whether the petitioner is fit to perform the duties of the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II in the Tamil Nadu Transport Subordinate Service. The Medical Board issued a certificate on 30.9.2011 certifying that the petitioner is fit to perform his duties as Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II. Again by communication dated 21.6.2011 addressed to the petitioner, he was directed to appear before the Committee for assessment of his working capacity and further informed that the date and time will be intimated by the Deputy Transport Commissioner, Salem. The said officer viz., the Deputy Transport Commissioner, Salem on 23.6.2011 directed the petitioner to appear before the Medical Board on 29.6.2011 at 3.00 p.m. Pursuant to the same, the petitioner appeared for assessment of his working capacity. According to the counter affidavit filed by the respondent dated 19.6.2012, the Medical Superintendent of the Government Mohan Kumaramangalam Medical College & Hospital, Salem, examined the petitioner and found that the petitioner is physically handicapped having 42% disability on the right upper limb due to post traumatic stiffness of right shoulder with mild restriction movement of right wrist and he is physically fit to perform the duties of the post of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II. Thus, it is evident that the duly constituted Medical Board assessed the ability of the petitioner regarding his capacity to perform the duties of the Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II and found that the petitioner is fit. The Committee constituted by the respondent also found on 29.6.2011 that the petitioner's performance in Motor Cycle and LMV was satisfactory.

12. It is not in dispute that even after the said assessment of his ability, he was not issued with the appointment order/posting order and on 18.8.2011 the petitioner submitted representation to the respondent for which there was no response. The petitioner submitted further representation to the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu on 17.2.2012 for which also there is no response. The only contention raised in the counter affidavit by the respondent is that a Committee was constituted to assess the working capacity of differently abled candidate, consisting of the Deputy Transport Commissioner, Salem; Regional Transport Officer, Salem (East); and Automobile Engineer, Motor Vehicles (Maintenance), Salem and the said Committee discussed the matter in detail in consultation with the Chairman of the Medical Board and they found that as the petitioner is having 42% of disability in the right hand, he cannot hold driving licence to drive transport vehicle and the Committee found that the petitioner is not eligible to drive the transport vehicle and recommended that the petitioner is not fit to perform the duties of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II and the report of the Committee was sent to the TNPSC on 4.8.2011 for taking further action and the reply from the TNPSC is awaited. In the notification issued by the TNPSC, while reserving 3% of posts to physically challenged persons, it was specifically mentioned that the physically handicapped persons should produce before appointment, the certificate of physical fitness of the Medical Board certifying that the candidate is capable of efficiently discharging the duties attached to the post. From the above narrated facts it is evident that the petitioner was issued with driving licence, he is approved as second Instructor in a

Driving School and the Medical Board also found that the petitioner is physically fit to discharge the duties of the Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II.

13. The Government of Tamil Nadu, to implement the welfare legislation viz., Section 33 of the Act, constituted an Expert Committee to identify posts under Group 'A' and 'B', which are to be filled through direct recruitment and the Expert Committee submitted its report based on which the Special Commissioner for disabled has furnished a list of 117 posts most suitable for disabled persons under 'A' and 'B' groups, which was also notified subsequently and the Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr.II post is coming within the 117 posts identified. While identifying the said posts, the Government was aware of the fact that orthopaedically handicapped, Blind and Deaf persons cannot have a valid heavy vehicle licence and they can only do office work. Further, the Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicle Rules, 1989, Chapter-II prescribes licensing of drivers of motor vehicles. Rule 4 states that the Regional Transport Officer or the Additional Regional Transport Officer as the case may be, within his jurisdiction shall be the Licensing Authority for the issue of Driving Licences. As per Rule 5, the Motor Vehicle Inspectors Gr-I and II shall be the Assistant Licensing Authorities in such areas as may be specified by the Licensing Authorities and the Assistant Licensing Authorities shall exercise their powers subject to such conditions or restrictions as may be specified by the Licensing Authority from time to time.

14. The respondent herein, contrary to the intention of the State Government, is hyper-technically interpreting the clause contained in the notification issued by the TNPSC, in spite of the Medical Board certifying that the petitioner is fit to perform the duties of Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II. The State Government having reserved 3% posts for physically challenged persons viz., Ortho, Blind and Deaf, it is fully aware of the fact that orthopaedically challenged/Blind/Deaf persons will not be in a position to drive the heavy vehicles like normal persons. Even assuming that an orthopaedically affected and Deaf persons can drive heavy motor vehicles, definitely a Blind person will not be in a position to drive any motor vehicle. Thus, the intention of the State Government is not to treat the physically challenged persons like other persons, who are having no physical disability.

15. Section 32 and 33 of Act 1 of 1996, which are relevant, are extracted hereunder:

"32. Identification of posts which can be reserved for persons with disabilities. Appropriate Governments shall

(a) identify posts, in the establishments, which can be reserved for the persons with disability;

(b) at periodical intervals not exceeding three years, review the list of posts identified and up-date the list taking into consideration the developments in technology.

33. Reservation of posts. Every appropriate Government shall appoint in every establishment such percentage of vacancies not less than three per cent for persons or class of persons with disability of which one per cent each shall be reserved for persons suffering from

(i) blindness or low vision;

(ii) hearing impairment;

(iii) locomotor disability or cerebral palsy, in the posts identified for each disability:

Provided that the appropriate Government may, having regard to the type of work carried on in any department or establishment, by notification subject to such conditions, if any, as may be specified in such notification, exempt any establishment from the provisions of this section."

16. Thus, it is evident that the Motor Vehicle Inspectors Gr-II is not the Licensing Authority as contended in the counter affidavit filed by the respondent stating that if the petitioner is allowed to work, he may face difficulties to execute his normal work i.e, when physically handicapped persons like the petitioner approaches for driving licence, he has to refuse to issue driving licence to the candidates invoking the provisions of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988. The said contention raised in the counter affidavit is contrary to the above referred rules viz., Rules 4 and 5 which shows how casually the respondent filed counter affidavit before this Court to deny appointment to the petitioner, who was already selected by the TNPSC for Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II Post. Even if the petitioner is not eligible to hold licence under Rule 5 of the Tamil Nadu Transport Subordinate Service, the respondent can very well approach the Government seeking relaxation of the said Rule under Rule 48 of the Tamil Nadu State and Subordinate Services Rules.

17. (a) The Government departments cannot deny appointment to physically challenged persons once the posts are identified. Similar issue was considered by the Division Bench of this Court in the decision reported in (2010) 4 MLJ 499 (R.Parthiban v. State of T.N.) in respect of appointment to the post of Lecturer in Physics under the quota for handicapped persons. The Division Bench held that the petitioner shall be appointed to the post of Lecturer in Physics under reservation for handicapped persons as the roster point available was for the backward class community and the petitioner therein was also a backward class candidate.

(b) The Honourable Supreme Court in the decision reported in (2007) 8 SCC 621 (Mahesh Gupta v. Yashwant Kumar Ahirwar) held that the States are obliged to make reservation for the physically disabled persons in terms of Act 1 of 1996. In paragraph 14 the Supreme Court held thus, "14. .... In terms of the 1995 Act, the States were obligated to make reservations for handicapped persons. The State completely lost sight of its commitment both under its own policy decision as also the statutory provision."

(c) In (2010) 7 SCC 626 (Government of India v. Ravi Prakash Gupta) a physically challenged candidate was denied appointment in the Indian Administrative Service on the ground that the posts were not identified by the Government of India and therefore the physically challenged person was not selected. In paragraphs 23 it is held thus, "23. That Respondent 1 is eligible for appointment in the civil services after



having been declared successful and having been placed at Serial No. 5 in the disabled category of visually impaired candidates, cannot be denied. The only question which is relevant for our purpose is whether on account of the failure of the petitioners to identify posts for persons falling within the ambit of Section 33 of the Disabilities Act, 1995, Respondent 1 should be deprived of the benefit of his selection purportedly on the ground that there were no available vacancies in the said category."

The Supreme Court held that identification of the post, which is provided under Section 32 of the Act, was to be made simultaneously on coming into operation of the Act, particularly Section 33 and the non-identification of the post under Section 32 cannot be used as a tool to deny the benefits of Section 33 to these categories of disabled persons.

(d) In (2010) 3 SCC 603 : 2010 AIR SCW 1795 (Syed Bashir-ud-din Qadri v. Nazir Ahmed Shah) a person appointed as Village Teaching Guide under the disabled category was discontinued on the ground that he could not write. The case filed by the said person was dismissed by the Jammu & Kashmir High Court, which was set aside by the Honourable Supreme Court. In paragraphs 57 to 60 (in SCC) the Supreme Court held thus, "57. It is unfortunate that in spite of the positive aspects of the appellant's functioning as Rehbar-e-Taleem and the clear and unambiguous object of the 1998 Act, the High Court adopted a view which was not compatible therewith. The High Court has dealt with the matter mechanically, without even referring to the 1998 Act or even the provisions of Sections 22 and 27 thereof. Instead, the High Court chose a rather unusual method in assessing the appellant's capacity to function as a teacher by calling him to appear before the Court and to respond to questions put to him.

58. The High Court appeared to be insensitive to the fact that as a victim of cerebral palsy, the appellant suffered from a slight speech disability which must have worsened on account of nervousness when asked to appear before the Court to answer questions. As has been submitted by Mr Gonsalves, the intimidating atmosphere in which the appellant found himself must have triggered a reaction which made it difficult for him to respond to the questions put to him.

59. In our view, since the Committee constituted to assess his performance as a teacher notwithstanding his disability had formed a favourable impression about him, his tenure as a Rehbar-e-Taleem ought to have been continued without being pitchforked into a controversy which was uncalled for.

60. We are convinced that the approach of the local authorities, as well as the High Court, was not in consonance with the objects of the 1998 Act and scheme of the State Government to fill up a certain percentage of vacancies with disabled candidates, and was too pedantic and rigid. The order of the High Court cannot, therefore, be sustained and has to be set aside."

(Emphasis Supplied)

18. The question as to how the officers should change their mind set and extend the benefit to the disabled persons as per Section 47 of the Act 1 of 1996 was considered by the Supreme Court in the decision in the case of Bhagwan Dass and another Vs. Punjab State Electricity Board (2008 (1) SCC 579). In paragraph 19, it is held thus:

"19. We understand that the concerned officers were acting in what they believed to be the best interests of the Board. Still under the old mind-set it would appear to them just not right that the Board should spend good money on someone who was no longer of any use. But they were quite wrong, seen from any angle. From the narrow point of view the officers were duty bound to follow the law and it was not open to them to allow their bias to defeat the lawful rights of the disabled employee. From the larger point of view the officers failed to realise that the disabled too are equal citizens of the country and have as much share in its resources as any other citizen. The denial of their rights would not only be unjust and unfair to them and their families but would create larger and graver problems for the society at large. What the law permits to them is no charity or largess but their right as equal citizens of the country."

(Emphasis Supplied) Thus it is evident that the respondent is still under the old mindset and he has followed rigid and pedantic approach while dealing with petitioner's appointment even after he was selected by TNPSC.

19. At this juncture it is relevant to point out that if the respondent was not satisfied that the petitioner is not fit to discharge the duties of the Motor Vehicle Inspector Gr-II as contended in the counter affidavit, no one prevented the respondent from approaching the Government seeking clarification for implementing the benevolent provision of law as mandated in Section 33 of Act 1 of 1996. In the light of the above findings, I am of the view that the petitioner has made out a case to issue a writ of mandamus.

20. In the result, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondent to issue appointment order to the petitioner after getting clarification from the Secretary, Transport Department, Government of Tamil Nadu, if necessary, within a period of four weeks from today. The petitioner, being a disabled person, is entitled to get a cost of Rs.10,000/-. Connected miscellaneous petition is closed. Post this matter on 6.8.2012 for reporting compliance.

vr To The Transport Commissioner, Transport Department, Chepauk Chennai 600 005