



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 02.11.2022

PRONOUNCED ON : 11.12.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.SARAVANAN

W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022
and WMP.Nos.10225, 10226, 15767,
15770 to 15772 & 15774 of 2022

W.P.No.10536 of 2022

Dhanapathyammal Self Employment and
Education Development Trust (DSED),
rep.by Director, R.Parthiban

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
- 3.The Chief Financial Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Finance Department
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

WEB COPY

4. The Hon'ble Minister,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Tamil Nadu, Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
5. The Commissioner,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Directorate,
Chepauk, Chennai 600 005.
6. The General Manager, (P-II)
State Industries Promotion Corporation
of Tamil Nadu Ltd. (SIPCOT),
19-A, Rukmani Lakshmipathy Road,
Egmore, Chennai 600 008.
7. The Project Officer,
State Industries Promotion Corporation
of Tamil Nadu Ltd. SIPCOT Industrial Growth Center,
R40, SIPCOT, Perundurai,
Tamil Nadu 638 052.
8. The Chairperson,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.
9. The Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and Development,
Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.
10. The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and
Development Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

WEB COPY

11. The Financial Advisor and Chief Accounts Officer,
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and
Development Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.
12. The General Manager-Administration,
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and Development Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.
13. The General Manager-Technical
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and Development Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.
14. The Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division,
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and Development Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.
15. K.Manivasan
16. S.Mudhumathi
- 17.Vijayarani
- 18.K.Vivekanandan
- 19.T.Anand
- 20.H.Krishnanunni
- 21.H.Prabavathy
- 22.K.Alagupandian
- 23.R.Saraswathi



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

24. M.Nisha

25. M/s.Best Corporation Private Limited,
2nd Street, Avinashi-Trippur Road,
Padmavathipuram, Tiruppur, Tamil nadu 641 603.

26. M/s.Valasumani Farm Machineries Private Limited,
42, Sivagari, Muthur Road, Erode,
Tamil Nadu 638 109.

27. M/s.RBWovens Private Limited,
59, Raja Street, Sanjay Nagar,
Narayanavalasu, Erode,
Tamil Nadu 638 011.

Prayer :- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the respondents relating to the Order No.PO/SIP-P/TAHDCO/2022 dated 10.02.2022 passed by the 7th respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the respondents 1 to 14, to pass necessary orders allotting 150.35 Acres including the 200 sheds constructed in the SIPCOT land at INGUR Perundurai, Erode, for 99 years lease, for one time lease amount of Rs.3 Crores together with the loan of Rs.5 Crores for alteration/maintenance of the aforesaid 200 sheds, to the petitioner Trust.

For Petitioner : Mr.N.L.Rajah
Senior Counsel
for Mr.V.Haribabu,
& Mr.P.Munusamy



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

For R1 to R5,

R15 to R18 & R20 : Mr.S.Silambanan
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Mrs.C.Sangamithirai

For R6 & R7 & R19 & R21 : Mr.P.Wilson
Senior Counsel
for Mr.M.Karthikjeyan
Spl.Govt.Pleader

For R8 to R14, R22 to R24 : Mr.C.A.Ashok Kumar

For R25 to R27 : Mr.V.P.Sengottuvel

W.P.No.16482 of 2022

Dhanapathyammal Self Employment and
Education Development Trust (DSED),
rep.by Director, R.Parthiban

... Petitioner

Vs.

- 1.The Principal Secretary to Government,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare (SCP)Department
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
- 2.The Commissioner,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Directorate,
Chepauk, Chennai 600 005.
- 3.The Managing Director,
State Industries Promotion Corporation
of Tamil Nadu Ltd. (SIPCOT),
19-A, Rukmani Lakshmipathy Road,
Egmore, Chennai 600 008.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

WEB COPY

4. The Project Officer,
State Industries Promotion Corporation
of Tamil Nadu Ltd. SIPCOT Industrial Growth Centre,
R40, SIPCOIT, Perundurai,
Tamil Nadu 638 052.

5. The Managing Director,
Adi Dravidar Housing and
Development Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.

6. K.Manivasan

7. Vijayarani

8. K. Vivekanandan

9. K. Alagupandian

10. M/s. Best Corporation Private Limited,
2nd Street, Avinashi-Trippur Road,
Padmavathipuram, Tiruppur, Tamil nadu 641 603.

11. M/s. Valasumani Farm Machineries Private Limited,
42, Sivagari, Muthur Road, Erode,
Tamil Nadu 638 109.

12. M/s. RBWovens Private Limited,
59, Raja Street, Sanjay Nagar,
Narayanavalasu, Erode,
Tamil Nadu 638 011.

.. Respondents



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

COMMON ORDER

WEB COPY

By this common order both these writ petitions are being disposed.

2. Both these Writ Petitions have been filed by the same person.

Relief sought for in these writ petitions, read as under:-

TABLE - 1

W.P.No.10536 of 2022 (filed on 22.04.2022)	W.P.No.16482 of 2022 (filed on 27.06.2022)
For the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the Order No.PO/ SIP-P/ TAHDCO/ 2022 dated 10.02.2022 passed by the 7 th Respondent and quash the same and consequently direct the Respondents 1 to 14, to pass necessary Orders allotting 150.35 Acres including the 200 sheds constructed in the SIPCOT land at INGUR, Perundurai, Erode, for 99 years lease, for one time lease amount of Rs.3 Crores together with the loan of Rs.5 Crores for alteration/maintenance of the aforesaid 200 sheds, to the Petitioner Trust.”	For the issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the allotment orders bearing No.P-I/SIGC-P/Best Corporation/2021, bearing Ref.No. P-I/ SIGC-P/ Valasumani/2021, bearing Ref.No.P-I/ SIGC-P/RB Woven/2021 dated 26.02.2021 for the total extent of 48.78 Acres of land, issued by 4 th respondent in favour of 10 th , 11 th & 12 th Respondents respectively, culminating into Lease Deeds bearing Doc.Nos.2995 of 2021, 2996 of 2021 & 2994 of 2021, SRO, Perundurai, all dated 22.04.2021, executed by 4 th Respondent pertaining to 10 th , 11 th & 12 th Respondents respectively, & the consequential letter (MS) No.10/SCP/2022 dated 02.03.2022



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

W.P.No.10536 of 2022 (filed on 22.04.2022)	W.P.No.16482 of 2022 (filed on 27.06.2022)
	issued by the 1 st respondent and quash the same and direct the respondents 1 to 5 to lease out the land of an extent of 150.35 Acres including the 200 sheds constructed in the SIPCOT land at INGUR, Perundurai, Erode, in accordance with the applicable Government Orders.”

3. The impugned order dated 10.02.2022 has been passed by the 7th respondent in W.P.No.10536 of 2022/4th Respondent in W.P.No.16482 of 2022, namely, The Project Officer, State Industries Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu Limited/, Industrial Growth Centre, Perundurai.

4. The order dated 10.02.2022 impugned in W.P.No.10536 of 2022 is addressed to the District Collector, Erode. The Impugned order dated 10.02.2022 reads as follows:-

“With Reference to the 1st Cited, we wish to inform that M/s.TAHDCO was allotted to an extent of 150.35 acres of land by erstwhile TACID as per G.O.Ms.No.58/AD & TW Department dated



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

28.03.1995 at the rate (Land Acquisition Cost) of Rs.1.35 lakhs per acre on 99 years long lease basis for the purpose of knitwear based industrial units exclusively for the benefit of Adi Dravidars and remitted the entire land cost of Rs.203.00 lakhs on 05.04.1995.

Further, the site was handed over to M/s.TAHDCO on 08.02.2003. The lease agreement was not yet executed with us till now. Accordingly, M/s.TAHDCO constructed 200 Nos. of sheds having plinth area of 186 sq.m. to a size of 15.5m*12m (Photos enclosed).

However, M/s.TAHDCO already created a separate infrastructure inside the said Plot No.Q1 partially like internal roads, Construction of Overhead Tank (50,000 litres capacity), UG sump, 3 Nos. of borewells, connectivity pipeline to the bath rooms and toilets, etc. The entire value of the assets created for utility of industrial purpose in one part of the said plot was diluted due to non usage for more than 20 years.

At present, there is no industries functioning so far and the buildings are under damaged condition in all means due to non-utilisation of building.

In the above circumstances, the unutilised portion of 48.78 acres were taken possession by SIPCOT on 11.02.2021 and the same was allotted to three companies viz.,

1. M/s. Best Corporation Private Limited – Plot No.Q-4/22.36 acres*
2. M/s. Valasumani Farm Machines Private Limited – Plot No.Q-3/8.95 acres*
3. M/s. R B Wovens Private Limited – Plot No.Q-2/17.38 acres*

This is for favour of kind information please.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

Encl.: As above. Yours faithfully Project Officer”

(* private respondents in the respective writ petition)

5. In W.P.No.10536 of 2022, the petitioner has also prayed for a consequential direction to the official respondents No.1 to 14 to pass necessary orders for allotting 150.35 acres including 200 sheds constructed in the SIPCOT Industrial, Growth Centre at Ingur, Perundurai for a period of 99 years.

6. Writ petition against R1, R3, R4 & R15 to R24 in W.P.No.10536 of 2022 were dismissed vide order dated 28.04.2022 as the Respondent No.5 to 14 and 25 to 27 alone are the contesting respondents.

7. The petitioner has filed W.P.No.16482 of 2022 on 27.06.2022, for a wider relief to call for the records relating to three separate allotment orders dated 26.02.2021 bearing reference P-I/SIGC-P/Best Corporation/2021, allotting an extent of 48.78 acres of land in favour of



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

the private respondents namely the 10th, 11th and 12th respondent in W.P.No.16482 of 2022 who are the 25th, 26th & 27th respondent in W.P.No.10536 of 2022.

8. Impugned letters dated 26.02.2021 impugned in W.P.No.16482 of 2022 is in respect of three different allotment letters issued to the respective private respondent allotting lands to them together with conditions stipulated therein.

9. As the prayer in W.P.No.16482 of 2022 reference to 22.04.2021 pertains to three lease deeds executed by the Project Officer of SIPCOT in favour of the private respondents namely, the 10th, 11th and 12th respondent in W.P.No.16482 of 2022 who are the 25th, 26th & 27th respondents in W.P.No.10536 of 2022.

10. By the aforesaid letter, the Principal Secretary to Adi Dravidar Welfare Department has directed the SIPCOT to release the necessary



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

funds for refund of the lease amount for 48.78 acres of land at Ingur,

Perundurai out of 1.85 out of allotted to vacant.

11. Post facto, by letter dated 02.03.2022, bearing reference: Letter (Ms).No.10/SCP/2022, the Principal Secretary to Government, has requested the District Collector to take necessary action to refund the lease amount for 48.78 acres of land in Ingur, Perundurai out of 150.35 acres to TAHDCO immediately.” Relevant portion of the order reads as under:-

“ I am directed to invite your attention to the references cited and to stated that in the reference 1st cited, G.O.(Ms).No.165 Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department, dated 15.07.1992, orders were issued for the formulation of a scheme by TAHDCO for establishing two knit wear based Industrial Estates exclusively for the benefit of Adi Dravidars one each at Mudalipalayam, Coimbatore District and another at Ingur in Erode District for creation of a class of entrepreneurs among the Scheduled Castes.

2. In the reference 2nd cited G.O.(Ms).No.58, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department, dated 28.03.1995 orders were issued permitting the Managing Director, TAHDCO to take over the allotment of an extent of 150.35 acres of compact block of lands in S.No.2, 4 etc., in Ingur Village, Perundurai Taluk, Periyar District from TACID



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

(now SIPCOT), Madras on lease-basis for a period of 99 years.

3. In the reference 3 cited, G.O.(Ms).No.59, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department, dated 28.03.1995, the Government sanction a sum of Rs.1600 lakhs initially from the Special Central Assistance funds available with TAHDCO for the construction of 200 hosiery units at the rate of Rs.8.00 lakhs per unit in Ingur Village, near Perundurai, Periyar District pending finalisation of units cost, pattern or financial assistance and selection of beneficiaries list. The above expenditure shall be adjusted from the project cost, later on.

4. In the letter 06.01.2021, the Managing Director, SIPCOT has stated that SIPCOT has cancelled the unutilized land measuring 48.78 acres at SIPCOT Industrial Growth Centre, Perundurai, as per the sketch and the refund towards the probable extent of land cancelled shall be made as per the prevailing policy of SIPCOT, after adjustment of accrued dues.

5. In the reference 5th cited, you have been requested to freeze the action of resuming back the land measuring 48.78 acres of land in Ingur, Perundurai till the final decision taken in the matter, as the matter could not be decided unilaterally and also the lease period has not been lapsed.

6. The above subject was placed in the 221th Board of Directors of TAHDCO held on 23.09.2021 and board has decided to send a proposal to Government. Hence, Managing Director, TAHDCO has sent proposal to get either equal extent of land on lease from SIPCOT



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

or to refund the lease amount by SIPCOT for the land resumed by them.

7. In this connection, after careful examination the Government has decided to request SIPCOT to refund the lease amount for the land resumed by them, as the lease period has not been lapsed.

8. I am therefore to request you to take necessary action to refund the lease amount for 48.78 acres of land in Ingur, Perudurai out of 150.35 acres to TAHDCO immediately.”

Yours faithfully,

Principal Secretary to Government”

12. Table below gives the details of the impugned allotment orders all dated 26.02.2021 of the Project Officer, State Industries Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu Limited, SIPCOT, Industrial Growth Centre, Perundurai, in 4th respondent W.P.No.16482 of 2022 / the 7th respondent in W.P.No.10536 of 2022. The total extent of land allotted in favour of the private respondents are continued below :-



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

TABLE - 2

Respondent in Writ petitions		Impugn ed Allotme nt Order dated	Bearing Referen ce:	Total Extent of land allotted in acres:	Cost of per acres	Consideratio n:
W.P.No.105 36/22	W.P.No.1648 2/22					
25 th Respondent	10 th Respondent	26.02.2021	P- I/SIGC -P/Best Corpor ation/2 021	22.36	Rs.7,84,37,200	35,07,924.86
M/s.Best Corporation Pvt.Ltd.,						
26 th Respondent	11 th Respondent	26.02.2021	P- I/SIGC - P/Vala sumani /2021	9.00	3,15,78,800	35,08,555.55
M/s.Valasumani Farm Machines Pvt.Ltd.,						
27 th Respondent	12 th Respondent	26.02.2021	P- I/SIGC -P/RB Woven /2021	17.42 acres	6,11,72,456	35,11,622.00
M/s.R.B.Wovens Pvt.Ltd.,						
		Total		48.78 acres		

13. Land measuring an extent of 150.37 acres was originally allotted to the Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing Development Corporation (herein after referred to as TAHDCO, for the sake of convenience), by the Tamil Nadu Corporation for Industrial Infrastructure Development Ltd. (TACID), under notification G.O.Ms.No.58, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department dated



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

28.03.1995, at the rate (Land Acquisition Cost) of Rs.1.35 lakhs per acre on 99 years long lease basis pursuant to G.O.(Ms.)No.165, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department dated 15.07.1992.

14. The land was allotted to TAHDCO for the purpose of setting up a knitwear based industrial units exclusively for the benefit of person belonging to Adi Dravidar Community.

15. Entire cost of Rs.203.00 lakhs was also paid to TACID. The site was also handed over to TAHDCO. After the land was allotted to TAHDCO, TACID was amalgamated with the State Industries Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu Limited (SIPCOT) in 2003.

16. SIPCOT however, failed to execute a 99 year old lease deed in favour of TAHDCO, even though, entire lease consideration of Rs.203 Lakhs was received by TACID from the Government of Tamil Nadu.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

WEB COPY

17. Over the land, TAHDCO had also reportedly constructed 200 sheds of plinth area of 186 sq.m. to a size of 15.5m * 12 m and had created further infrastructure inside each shed for the purpose of scheme.

18. Applications were to be processed by Tamil Nadu Industrial Investment Corporation Limited (TIIC) adopting the procedure that was being followed. While sanctioning loans to entrepreneurs, TIIC was to hold workshops/seminars, wherein applicants were to be invited and explained of the scheme.

19. There are no documents filed by the TAHDCO to show that any meaningful steps were taken to ensure that the scheme under the above mentioned notifications were implemented and were realized by training the entrepreneurs as was required under the notification.

20. The Government selected 26 candidates and 30 candidates were selected and kept in waiting list. 200 Sheds that were constructed



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

did not see any use due to lack of interest, reluctance on the part of beneficiaries .

21. Later, the Government vide G.O.Ms.No.75, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department, dated 06.09.2000, cancelled the selection of 26 applicants as they were not interested in commencing venture. The project however did not take off due to lack of awareness and various other factors including lack of resource among entrepreneurs from the members of the community for whom the scheme was targeted

22. G.O.Ms.No.110, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department dated 30.12.2002 was issued as per which even groups of men who formed a cohesive unit were to be encouraged to get the industrial sheds allotted. Relevant clause for encouraging Self Help Groups in G.O.Ms.No.110 Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department dated 3.12.2002 reads as under:-

“Self Help Gropus:

The Government direct that while selecting the beneficiaries, Managing Director, TIIC should



encourage Self Help Groups to undertake suitable projects based on their experience. Even groups of men who form a cohesive unit can also be encouraged.”

23. The Managing Director of TIIC was directed to ensure that the selection of 200 beneficiaries of the Ingur Industrial Estate and 46 beneficiaries for the Mudalipalayam Industrial Estate was to be taken up by TIIC based on the financial viability of the project, networth, expertise of the promoter, willingness and capability of the entrepreneurs to undertake commercially viable project.

24. The system of selection was through a Committee constituted by the Government in G.O.(Ms)No.21, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department dated 01.02.1993 was superseded. After the selection of beneficiaries, TIIC was to get prior clearance of the Government for the list of the beneficiaries before sanctioning loan applications. Thus, multi pronged steps were taken to ensure that the projects reaches the beneficiaries.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

25. The petitioner appears to have filed application for allotment of the sheds as a cohesive Self Help Groups/group of men in terms of G.O.Ms.No.110 Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department dated 3.12.2002. The Government also directed the Managing Director, TAHDCO to release advertisement calling for application through one English and one Tamil daily.

26. The petitioner appears to have sent several letters since 2009 to not only to the Respondent, Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department (TAHDCO), Tamil Nadu Industrial Investment Corporation Limited (TIIC) but also to the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu.

27. By letter dated 29.09.2009, the Commissioner of Adi Dravidar Welfare Department in his communication to the Managing Director TAHDCO merely acknowledged the receipt of the application filed by the petitioner and informed that suitable steps will be taken by later.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

28. The Commissioner, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department by letter dated 24.11.2009, forwarded the application of the petitioner to the Managing Director, TAHDCO forwarded the application and directed the Managing Director of TAHDCO to inform the petitioner about the steps being taken for allotting the RCC sheds to the petitioner out of 200 sheds built in Ingur in Perundurai Erode District. Relevant portion of letter dated 24.11.2009 of the Commissioner , Adi dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department addressed to the Managing Director, TAHDCO reads as under:-

“நக.எண்.எச் 1/26730/09 நாள் : 24.11.2009

அய்யா.

பொருள் : ஆதிதிராவிடர் நலம் -ஈரோடு மாவட்டம் -பெருந்துறை தாலுக்கா ஈங்கூர் தாட்கோ மூலம் கட்டப்பட்ட 200 எண்ணிக்கை கொண்ட தொழிற்கூடங்கள் RCC ஞானன மற்றும் காலி இடம் நீண்டகால குத்தகைக்கு வேண்டுதல் சம்பந்தமாக,

பார்வை : திரு. இராபார்த்திபன் B.E., L.L.B., இயக்குநர் தனபதி அம்மாள் சுயவேலைவாய்ப்பு கல்வி மற்றும் சமூகமேம்பாட்டு அறக்கட்டளை அலமேலுபுரம். விழுப்புரம் மாவட்டம்,

ஈரோடுமாவட்டம் பெருந்துறை தாலுக்கா ஈங்கூர் தாட்கோமூலம் கட்டப்பட்ட 200 எண்ணிக்கை கொண்ட தொழிற்கூடங்கள் RCC Shed மற்றும் காலி இடம் நீண்டகால குத்தகைக்கு வேண்டியது குறித்த மனுவை நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கும் பொருட்டு இத்துடன் இணைத்து அனுப்பப்படுகிறது. மேற்படி நடவடிக்கையின் விவரத்தை மனுதாரருக்கு தெரிவிக்கும்படி கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்,



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

ஆதிதிராவிடர் நல ஆணையருக்காக,”

WEB COPY

29. Since the petitioner did not receive any positive feedback from the Managing Director of TAHDCO, the petitioner has also approached the Chief Minister's Cell. The Chief Minister's Cell has also sent a reminder to the Office of the Managing Director of TAHDCO. Thus, by letter dated 21.12.2009, the Managing Director of the TAHDCO responded to the Chief Ministers Cell and stated as follows:-

“க.எண்.எச்5/2582/09 நாள்:21.12.2009

பெறுநர்

தனிஅலுவலர்.

முதலமைச்சரின் தனிபிரிவு.

புனித ஜார்ஜ் தோட்டை.

சென்னை- 9.

ஐயா.

பொருள் : ஈரோடு மாவட்டம் - பெருந்துறை
தாலுக்கா- ஈங்கூர் - தாட்கோ மூலம் கட்டப்பட்ட
200 எண்ணிக்கை கொண்ட தொழிற் கூடங்கள்
RCC Shed மற்றும் காலி இடம் நீண்டகால
குத்தகைக்கு வேண்டுதல் குறித்து.

பார்வை : தனபதிஅம்மாள் சுய வேலைவாய்ப்பு
கல்வி மற்றும் சமூகமேம்பாட்டு அறக்கட்டளை
விழுப்புரம் திரு.இரா.பார்த்திபன் அவர்களின்
கடிதம் மற்றும் முதலமைச்சரின் தனிபிரிவு
க.எண்.281422.ER.A91/09, நாள் 23.10.2009



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

WEB COPY

பார்வையில் காணும் மனுதாரர் திரு.இராபார்த்திபன் அவர்கள் தமிழகத்தில் உள்ள அனைத்து ஆதிதிராவிடர் மாணவியர் மாணவர்கள் நலன் மற்றும் வேலையில்லா பட்டதாரிகளுக்கு தொழில் முனைவோர் பயிற்சி மையம் ஆராய்ச்சிமையம் தொழில் நுட்பம் மற்றும் மருத்துவ கல்லூரி இலவச மருத்துவ சேவைமையம் அமைக்க ஈங்கூர் கூடங்கள் மற்றும் காலியிடங்கள் நீண்டகால குத்தகைக்கு வழங்க கோரியுள்ளார்,

அரசு ஆணை எண்.110ன் படி தமிழ்நாடு தொழில் முதலீட்டு கழகத்தின் மூலம் கடன் வழங்க ஒப்புதல் அளித்து அரசு ஆணை பெற்ற பிறகு தொழிற் கூடம் ஒதுக்கித்தர ஆணையிடப்பட்டுள்ளது, இது சம்மந்தமாக வேறு நிதி நிறுவனங்களின் மூலம் கடன் வழங்க ஒப்புதல் அளிக்கப்படும் பயனாளிகளுக்கு தொழிற்கூடம் ஒதுக்க அரசு ஆணையில் திருத்தம் கோரி தாட்கோவின் முன் மொழிவு சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்டுள்ளது. தாட்கோவின் முன் மொழிவிற்கு அரசிடமிருந்து ஆணைப் பெறப்பட்டதும் பயனாளி கோரிய தொழிற்கூடம் சம்மந்தமாக முடிவு மேற்கொள்ளப்படும் என தெரிவித்துக் கொள்ளப்படுகிறது,

மேலாண்மை இயக்குநருக்காக,”

30. It appears that a proposal was submitted before TAHDCO to amend the Government Order to allot factories to the beneficiaries who could get loans from other financial institutions. It was informed that a decision will be taken once the order is received from the Government before TAHDCO, for Managing Director.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

31. Thus, it was informed that the request of the petitioner to get loan from other Financial bodies was under consideration and suitable amendment will be made to G.O.Ms.No.110, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department dated 30.12.2002 after getting necessary permission of the Government. As late as, 27.12.2013, the petitioner had sent a letter to Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing Development Corporation (TAHDCO).

32. It appears that the petitioner thereafter did not follow with the respondent and assumed that G.O.Ms.No.110 dated 30.12.2002 will be amended and industrial shed will be allotted to the petitioner.

33. Meanwhile, the Project Director, SIPCOT has however decided to allot the land to measuring a total extent of 48.78 acres out of 150.35 acres in favour of the private respondents, even though, the land for all practical purpose was under the control of TAHDCO although a Lease Deed was never executed in favour of TAHDCO either by SIPCOT's or its predecessor namely TACID.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

34. Thus, the possession of 48.78 acres out of 150.35 acres of land is said to have been resumed by SIPCOT on 11.2.2021 and handed over to the private respondents.

35. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that letter dated 02.03.2022 of the Principal Secretary to Government, the content of which has been extracted above cannot authorize to take over of the land by SIPCOT, as a Government Order can be modified only by another Government Order. The said letter of the Principal Secretary to Government dated 02.03.2022 *post facto* cannot modify a Government Orders. Land allotted to TAHDCO cannot be allotted to the private respondents

36. In this connection, a reference is made to the decision of this Court rendered in the following two cases:-

- i. **TAHDCO Contractors Association Vs. The Principal Secretary to Government,** W.P.No.4314 of 2010 dated 15.09.2010;
- ii. **K.Sampath Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu and Ors.,** W.P.(MD).No.4921 of 2006.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

WEB COPY

37. That apart, it is submitted that the Government has also not filed any counter. It is not for an officer of TAHDCO, to explain the studied silence of the Government by stating that the Managing Director of Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing Development Corporation, TAHDCO, was authorized to file affidavit on behalf of the Principal Secretary to Government, the Commissioner, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department and the individuals R6, R7, R8 & R9.

38. It is submitted that the Government also cannot rely on the counter filed by the SIPCOT. It is further submitted that the petitioner has *locus standi* to question the allotment made in favour of the private respondents.

39. Merely because deponent has been blacklisted as the contractor, *ipso facto* will not mean that irregular resumption of land and irregular allotment of land in favour of the private respondents can be ignored.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

40. The argument that the petitioner and the deponent who has filed these writ petitions are different cannot be accepted as the Trust has been constituted by the members of the same family which is given the deponent wide powers.

41. Merely, because the petitioner is a registered Trust and is meant to espouse the interest of downtrodden and persons from marginalized section of the society, particularly those belonging to the Adi Dravidar Community, appears ipso facto mean that the petitioners intentions are not bonafide.

42. Whether the petitioner can act as a catalyst for ensuring the objectives of the Government Orders in G.O.Ms.No.165, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department, dated 15.07.1992, G.O.Ms.No.21, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department, dated 01.02.1993 and G.O.Ms.No.110, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department, dated 30.12.2002 are acted upon is highly debatable as the petitioner's managing trustee does not have a clean and unblemished track record.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

43. Merely because 83 beneficiaries who were identified failed to live up to the expectation of the Government which led to resulted in cancellation of allotment of sheds *ipso facto* would not mean that the project has to be abandoned and that the land earmarked for the welfare of persons belonging to Adi Dravidar Community can be given away to private entrepreneurs/industrial units.

44. By virtue of G.O.Ms.No.110, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department, dated 30.12.2002, the restriction of economic activity in the industrial shed to knitwear was removed and was expanded to include of types of unit that were financially viable and potentially viable. However, it did not permit allotment of land to the private respondents taking away the benefit welfare scheme.

45. There was no transparency in the allotment of land in favour of the private respondent herein. Straight away, applications of the private respondent were accepted and allotment were made out of turn. It shows undue alacrity to making out of turn allotment.



WEB COPY

46. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance on the following decisions:

- i. **M/s.Erusian Equipment and Chemicals Limited Vs. State of West Bengal and Another**, (1975) 1 SCC 70;
- ii. **Ramana Dayaram Shetty Vs. International Airport Authority of India and Others**, (1979) 3 SCC 489;
- iii. **Ashok Kumar Yadav and Others Vs. State of Haryana and Others**, (1985) 4 SCC 417;
- iv. **K.I.Shephard and Others Vs. Union of India and Others**, (1987) 4 SCC 431;
- v. **Tata Cellular Vs. Union of India**, (1994) 6 SCC 651;
- vi. **Asia Foundation and Construction Limited Vs. Trafalgar House Construction (I) Limited and Others**, (1997) 2 SCC 738;
- vii. **Union of India and Another Vs. International Trading Co. and Another**, (2003) 5 SCC 437;
- viii. **Reliance Airport Developers (P) Ltd., Vs. Airports Authority of India and Others**, (2006) 10 SCC;
- viii. **Oryx Fisheries Private Limited Vs. Union of India and Others**; (2010) 13 SCC 427;



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

- ix. **Kulja Industries Limited Vs. Chief General Manager, Western Telecom Project Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited and Others**, (2014) 14 SCC 731;
- x. **Gorkha Security Services Vs. Government (NCT of Delhi) and Others**; (2014) 9 SCC 105;
- xi. **State of Karnataka Vs. Appa Balu Ingale and Others**; 1995 SUPP (4) SCC 469;
- xii. **Raunaq International Limited Vs. I.V.R. Construction Limited and Others**, (1999) 1 SCC 492;
- xiii. **Kumaon Mandal Vikas Nigam Limited Vs. Girja Shankar Pand and Others**, (2001) 1 SCC 182;
- xiv. **Dhurandhar Prasad Singh Vs. Jai Prakash University and Others**, (2001) 6 SCC 534;
- xv. **National Insurance Co. Ltd., Vs. Keshav Bahadur and Others**, (2004) 2 SCC 370;
- xvi. **Kannaiyan Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu**, 2004 (4) MLJ 651;
- xvii. **Centre for Public Interest Litigation and Others Vs. Union of India and Others**, (2012) 3 SCC 1;



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

xviii. **Uflex Limited Vs. Government of Tamil Nadu and Others**, (2022) 1 SCC 165;

xix. **Shobha Suresh Jumanani Vs. Appellate Tribunal, Forfeited Property and Another**, (2001) 5 SCC 755;

xx. **R.P.Bhardwaj Vs. Union of India and Others**, (2005) 10 SCC 244;

xxi. **K.Sampath Vs. The State of Tamil Nadu and Others**, MANU/TN/9958/2006;

47. The submission of Mr.S.Silambanan, learned AAG adopting the counter affidavit of TAHDCO, in W.P.No.16482 of 2022 and drew attention to paragraph 13. Paragraph 13 reads as follows:-

“13. A regards the averments made in Paragraph 15 and 20 of the affidavit, it is submitted, the petitioner Trust, addressed a representation dated: 20.10.2009, replied by TAHDCO that அரசு ஆணை எண்.110ன் படி தமிழ்நாடு தொழில் முதலீட்டு கழகத்தின் மூலம் கடன் வழங்க ஒப்புதல் அளித்து அரசு ஆணை பெற்ற பிறகு தொழிற்கூடம் ஒதுக்கிற்கான ஆணையிடப்பட்டுள்ளது, இது சம்மந்தமாக வேறு நிதி நிறுவனங்களின் மூலம் கடன் வழங்க ஒப்புதல் அளிக்கப்படும் பயனாளிகளுக்கு தொழிற்கூடம் ஒதுக்க அரசாணையில் திருத்தம்



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

கோரி தாட்கோவில் முன்மொழிவிற்கு
அரசிடமிருந்து ஆணை பெறப்பட்ட பின்
பயனாளி கோரிய தொழிற்கூடம் சம்மந்தமாக
முடிவு மேற்கொள்ளப்படும் என தெரிவித்துக்
கொள்ளப்படுகிறது.”

48. The learned Senior Counsel for the SIPCOT would submit that there were no representation by the petitioner after initial representation in 2013. The petitioner Trust appears to be unaware about the allotment to 83 beneficiaries and their subsequent cancellation. It is submitted that Selection Committee consisting of 9 members was constituted by the Government to chose the eligible allottees. Allotment was made to 83 beneficiaries vide G.O.Ms.No.60 dated 28.6.2002. G.O.Ms.No.60 dated 28.6.2002 was later cancelled vide G.O.Ms.No.38 dated 13.3.2020 as there was no interest from beneficiaries.

49. The learned counsel Mr.V.P.Sengottuvel, reiterated the submissions and submitted that the petitioner has no *locus standi* is not relevant for the reasons already submitted.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

50. It is submitted that the Managing Trustee, K.Dhanapathyammal died in the year 2019 and Mrs.R.Ananthayee died around 5 years ago while Mrs.Mallika resigned in the year 2010.

51. He drew attention to paragraph 15 of the Common Counter Affidavit of Best Corporation Private Limited” in W.P.No.10536 & 16482 of 2022. Paragraph 15 of the Common Counter Affidavit reads as follows:

“It is submitted that the above two speculative Writ Petitions filed by the Trust represented by its Director, does not seem to be bonafide and genuine for the following reasons:

- a) The Trust was formed on 28.08.2009 with one Founder/Chairman, one Managing Trustee and five Trustees.*
- b) Clause IX (a) of the Trust Deed States that All the executive powers of the Trust shall vest with the Management Trustee and he shall be the authority to use and to be sued on behalf of the Board of Trustee. Hence, the above Writ Petitions filed by the Trust represented by someone claiming to be a Director, is contrary to conditions of the Trust Deed.*
- c) In the Affidavit in support of the above*



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

Writ Petitions, the deponent states that Founder Trustee K.Dhanapathyammal died in the year 2019, R.Ananthayee died 5 years ago, Mallika and Anjalai resigned in the year 2010, but went on to claim that he was appointed as a Director under resolution dated 02.09.2009 (Pg.No.267 in the paper book of W.P.No.16482/2022) signed by P.Saraswathi, A.Rajalakshmi and B.Abirami. It may be pertinent to note that on the date of resolution i.e., 02.09.2009 which was said to have been passed within 4 days from the formation of the Trust, was signed by only two trustees while A.Rajalakshmi was not a trustee at all.

- d) The Trust Deed does not state that the same has been formed solely for the welfare of Adi Dravidar Community or for the people belonging to the Scheduled Caste. But it states that the Trust is for the up-liftment of the weaker section in the society irrespective of creed or religion and providing them systematically education and foster social, economic, cultural and educational growth.*

It is submitted that the above facts demonstrate that the above Writ Petitions have been filed by the Trust represented by its Director, is to get a direction from this Hon'ble Court for allotment of the entire industrial plots in 150.35 Acres with 200 industrial sheds etc., to it in the guise of Trust."



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

52. It is therefore submitted that only three Trustees were there, namely Mrs.P.Saraswathi, Mrs.V.Abirami and Mrs.A.Rajeshwari. They have placed reliance on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Oriental Bank of Commerce Vs. Sunder Lal Jain and Another**, (2008) 2 SCC 280 wherein it was held that *Before granting the writ the court may, and should, look to the larger public interest which may be concerned-an interest which private litigants are apt to overlook when striving for private ends. The court should act in view of all the existing facts, and with due regard to the consequences which will result. It is in every case a discretion dependent upon all the surrounding facts and circumstances.* Relevant portion of the said order reads as under:-

“11. The principles on which a Writ of Mandamus can be issued have been stated as under in The Law of Extraordinary Legal Remedies by F.G. Ferris and F.G.Ferris, Jr.:

“Note 187. Mandamus, at common law, is a highly prerogative writ, usually issuing out of the highest court of general jurisdiction, in the name of the sovereignty, directed to any natural person, corporation or inferior court within the jurisdiction,



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

requiring them to do some particular thing therein specified, and which appertains to their office or duty. Generally speaking, it may be said that mandamus is a summary writ, issuing from the proper court, commanding the official or board to which it is addressed to perform some specific legal duty to which the party applying for the writ is entitled of legal right to have performed.

Note 192 - Mandamus is, subject to the exercise of a sound judicial discretion, the appropriate remedy to enforce a plain, positive, specific and ministerial duty presently existing and imposed by law upon officers and others who refuse or neglect to perform such duty, when there is no other adequate and specific legal remedy and without which there would be a failure of justice. The chief function of the writ is to compel the performance of public duties prescribed by statute, and to keep subordinate and inferior bodies and tribunals exercising public functions within their jurisdictions. It is not necessary, however, that the duty be imposed by statute; mandamus lies as well for the enforcement of a common law duty.

Note 196 - Mandamus is not a writ of right. Its issuance unquestionably lies in the sound judicial discretion of the court, subject always to the well-settled principles which have been established by the courts. An action in mandamus is not governed by the principles of ordinary litigation where the matters alleged on



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

one side and not denied on the other are taken as true, and judgment pronounced thereon as of course. While mandamus is classed as a legal remedy, its issuance is largely controlled by equitable principles. Before granting the writ the court may, and should, look to the larger public interest which may be concerned-an interest which private litigants are apt to overlook when striving for private ends. The court should act in view of all the existing facts, and with due regard to the consequences which will result. It is in every case a discretion dependent upon all the surrounding facts and circumstances.

Note 206 - The correct rule is that mandamus will not lie where the duty is clearly discretionary and the party upon whom the duty rests has exercised his discretion reasonably and within his jurisdiction, that is, upon facts sufficient to support his action."

12. These very principles have been adopted in our country. In Bihar Eastern Gangetic Fishermen Coop. Society Ltd. v. Sipahi Singh after referring to the earlier decisions in Lekhraj Sathramdas Lalvani v. N.M.Shah, Rai Shivendra Bahadur (Dr.) v. Nalanda College and Umakant Saran (Dr.) v. State of Bihar this Court observed as follows in para 15 of the Reports (SCC): (Sipahi Singh Case, SCC pp.152-53)

"15. There is abundant authority in favour of the proposition that a writ of mandamus can be granted only in a



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

case where there is a statutory duty imposed upon the officer concerned and there is a failure on the part of that officer to discharge the statutory obligation. The chief function of a writ is to compel performance of public duties prescribed by statute and to keep subordinate tribunals and officers exercising public functions within the limit of their jurisdiction. It follows, therefore, that in order that mandamus may issue to compel the authorities to do something, it must be shown that there is a statute which imposes a legal duty and the aggrieved party has a legal right under the statute to enforce its performance. In the instant case, it has not been shown by Respondent 1 that there is any statute or rule having the force of law which casts a duty on Respondents 2 to 4 which they failed to perform. All that is sought to be enforced is an obligation flowing from a contract which, as already indicated, is also not binding and enforceable. Accordingly, we are clearly of the opinion that Respondent 1 was not entitled to apply for grant of a writ of mandamus under Article 226 of the Constitution and the High Court was not competent to issue the same.”

Therefore, in order that a writ of mandamus may be issued, there must be a legal right with the party asking for the writ of compel the performance of some statutory duty case upon the



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

authorities. The respondents have not been able to show that there is any statute or rule having the force of law which casts a duty on the appellant Bank to declare their account as NPA from 31.03.2000 and apply RBI Guidelines to their case.”

53. I have considered the arguments advanced by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel for the respective respondents. I have also perused the Government orders and the documents filed along with these two writ petitions.

54. Unilateral resumption of land measuring an extent of 48.78 Acres out of 150.35 Acres of land allotted to the TAHDCO by the SIPCOT and allotment 48.78 Acres of the land to the private respondents is arbitrary and in excess of the powers vested with the SIPCOT.

55. The argument that no reason has been stated in the affidavit as to why the petitioner Trust was in-active for 8 years in pursuing with the Government for allotment of land is not relevant.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

56. The submission of the learned Senior Counsel for SIPCOT that the petitioner has no *locus standi* to challenge the allotment, although correct, cannot be ignored at the same time.

57. Even, if the petitioner lacked *locus standi*, the Court cannot turn a Nelson's eyes as the irregular allotment of the lands in favour of the private respondents were made which are arbitrary and are therefore liable to be declared to be irregular.

58. Even if the petitioner lacks the *locus standi*, the Court cannot close its eyes to irregularity committed by the officials of SIPCOIT and the Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department allotting the lands to the private respondents without following the due proper procedure. Irregular allotment of land also do not justify the action of the SIPCOT.

59. These allotment of the land in favour of the private respondents is also contrary to the provisions of the Tamil Nadu



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

Transparency in Tenders Act, 1998.

WEB COPY

60. Interview conducted by the Selection Committee on basis online application smacks of arbitrariness. *Post facto*, approval for cancellation and resumption of land by SIPCOT and payment of the lease amount for the resumed portion of the land is not sufficient.

61. The allotment of land should have also involved a public auction by calling for a tender ensuring public participation so that the best price could have been fixed.

62. There are also no records to show that proper advertisements were made in the by SIPCOT before receiving applications from the private respondents.

63. Further, SIPCOT has taken advantage of its own breach in not executing the lease deed in favour of TAHDCO after having received entire lease consideration from the Government after the land was



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

allotted to TAHDCO under G.O.Ms.No.58/AD & TW Department dated 28.03.1995.

64. The fact that the vacant land was being used as a playground, grazing lands for cattle by the villagers, as pathway and that there was also a small temple present in the said land did not justify resumption and allotment of 48.78 acres of land to the private respondents.

65. Merely, because there is a huge demand for lands business person for setting up and establishing industries was not a sufficient reason to make irregular allotment.

66. Proper procedure ought to have been followed by SIPCOT before even venture to resume the land from TAHDCO and in allotting it to the private respondents.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

WEB COPY

67. The fact that no Lease Deed was executed between SIPCOT and TAHDCO, as TAHDCO wanted outright sale of the plot which was not agreeable to SIPCOT is also irrelevant. One mistake will not justify another mistake.

68. *Post facto*, letter of SIPCOT informing the allotment and execution of lease in favor of the private respondents is also highly arbitrary and is to be frowned upon.

69. The resumption of land to an extent of 48.78 Acres and their allotment and further execution of lease deed in favour of the private respondents by SIPCOT were irregular as scarce resource viz land meant for achieving the laudatory objects of part IV of the Constitution of India has been sacrificed on the altar in favour of the private respondents and allotted in favour of the private respondents in an irregular fashion.

70. Therefore, resumption of land without a proper Government



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

Order cancellation of previous Government Orders and allotment of land in favour of the private respondents are liable to be declared as irregular.

71. Arbitrary decisions have been by SIPCOT with the Officials of the Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department to process applications from the private respondents across the table to allot 48.78 acres of land out of 150.35 acres of land from the Ingur Industrial park to the private respondents was clearly without following proper procedure.

72. A proper procedure for resumption of land by SIPCOT should have first preceded by a prior Government Order recalling, the earlier Government Orders under which the land was allotted to TAHDCO.

73. However, the fact remains that the purpose for which the land measuring an extent of 150.35 acres was allotted to TAHDCO in the year 1995 had not been achieved as the project never took off for which various Government Orders were issued.



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

74. The private respondents have put up their units/factories by investing in the infrastructure. To ask these private respondents to vacate the premises would mean imposing a incalculable harm on them for the mistakes of the concerned officers from the Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department and SIPCOT.

75. To ask the private respondents to vacate and demolish the factory would also mean loss of natural resources utilized in developing them. Court cannot order such drastic measures.

76. Therefore, 48.78 acres of land out of 150.35 acres of land allotted to the private respondents herein cannot be disturbed.

77. Therefore, to balance the interest of the parties, Court is not inclined to disturb the possession of the land and their utilization by the private respondents as they have developed units/infrastructure pursuant to the impugned allotment letters on the land measuring at 48.78 acres out of 150.37 acres.



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

78. Therefore, the following orders are passed:-

- i) The amount received towards lease deed from the private respondents by SIPCOT is directed to be transferred together with interest at bank rate within a period of 30 days from today to TAHDCO.
- ii) The value of lease adopted in favour of the private respondents shall be re-examined and revisited and the difference in the market value of the land that prevailed in 2021 shall be paid to TAHDCO by the private respondents.
- iii) The private respondents shall pay the difference directly to the TAHDCO.
- iv) The amount of lease to be transferred and deposited to TAHDCO by SIPCOT and to be paid by the private respondents shall be utilized for the welfare activities to be under taken by TAHDCO.



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

- v) The Government shall issue suitable notification for regularizing allotment the land to the extent of 48.78 acres of land in favour of the private respondents by the TAHDCO and regularize the commercial activity of the private respondents ensuring that the private rights of the private respondents are not compromised except to the extent specified herein. Petitioner request for allotment of existing infrastructure may be considered by suitably amending G.O.Ms.No.110, Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department dated 30.12.2002.
- vi) The Government may issue suitable Government Orders to ensure employment opportunities are created in the land used by these private parties in favour of the persons belonging to the Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Community for whose benefit the land was allotted to TAHDCO way back in the year 1993 vide G.O.(MS)No.21,



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

Adi Aravidar and Tribal Welfare Department

dated 01.02.1993.

- vii) This exercise shall be carried out by the Government as expeditiously as possible within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

These writ petitions stand disposed of with the above directions.

11.12.2023

Index : Yes/No

Neutral Citation : Yes/No

kkd

Note : Registry is directed to return the original files to the learned counsel for SIPCOT

Issue Order copy on 19.01.2024

To

1.The Principal Secretary to Government,



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

WEB COPY

- Government of Tamil Nadu,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
2. The Principal Secretary to Government,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
 3. The Chief Financial Secretary,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Finance Department
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
 4. The Hon'ble Minister,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
Tamil Nadu, Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.
 5. The Commissioner,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Directorate,
Chepauk, Chennai 600 005.
 6. The General Manager, (P-II)
State Industries Promotion Corporation
of Tamil Nadu Ltd. (SIPCOT),
19-A, Rukmani Lakshmipathy Road,
Egmore, Chennai 600 008.
 7. The Project Officer,
State Industries Promotion Corporation
of Tamil Nadu Ltd. SIPCOT Industrial Growth Center,
R40, SIPCOT, Perundurai,
Tamil Nadu 638 052.
 8. The Chairperson,
Adi Dravidar and Tribal Welfare Department,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.
 9. The Chairman,
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and Development,



W.P.Nos.10536 & 16482 of 2022

WEB COPY

Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.

10. The Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and
Development Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.
11. The Financial Advisor and Chief Accounts Officer,
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and
Development Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.

C.SARAVANAN, J.

kkd

12. The General Manager-Administration,
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and Development Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.
13. The General Manager-Technical
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and Development Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.
14. The Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division,
Tamil Nadu Adi Dravidar Housing and Development Corporation,
No.31, Cenotaph Road, 2nd Lane, Teynampet,
Chennai, Tamil Nadu 600 018.
15. The Managing Director,