



W.A.No.3906 of 2025 etc.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.08.2026

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR. SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI,
CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.ARUL MURUGAN

W.A.Nos.3906 of 2025 and 1721 of 2026
and C.M.P.Nos.15699 and 2389 of 2026, 31812 of 2025

W.A.No.3906 of 2025:

Arigaa Crane Services Private Limited
Rep. by its Director, Sankarasekar,
Vallam, Vadagal, Sriperumbudur,
Kancheepuram - 602105.

Appellant(s)

Vs

1. The Chairman and Managing Director
State Industries Promotion Corporation
of Tamil Nadu Limited (SIPCOT), 19-A,
Rukmani Lakshmipathi Road, Egmore,
Chennai - 600008.
2. The District Collector
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram-631 501.
3. The Special Tahsildar
Land Acquisition, Sriperumbudur Taluk,
Chennai-602 105.



W.A.No.3906 of 2025 etc.

4. The Estate Officer
SIPCOT Industrial Park, Vallam, Vadagal,
Sriperumbudur, Chennai-602 105.

Respondent(s)

W.A.No.1721 of 2026:

1. Arigaa Crane Services Private Limited
Rep. by its Directors,
Mangaiyarkkarasi and Sankarasekar,
Vallam, Vadagal, Sriperumbudur,
Kancheepuram - 602105.
2. Sankarasekar
Vallam, Vadagal, Sriperumbudur,
Kancheepuram - 602105.

Appellant(s)

Vs

1. The Chairman and Managing Director
State Industries Promotion Corporation
of Tamil Nadu Limited (SIPCOT), 19-A,
Rukmani Lakshmipathi Road, Egmore,
Chennai - 600008.
2. The District Collector
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram-631 501.
3. The Special Tahsildar
Land Acquisition, Sriperumbudur Taluk,
Chennai-602 105.
4. The Estate Officer
SIPCOT Industrial Park, Vallam, Vadagal,
Sriperumbudur, Chennai-602 105.

Respondent(s)



W.A.No.3906 of 2025 etc.

PRAYER in W.A.No.3906 of 2025: Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent to set aside the order dated 24.11.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.31483 of 2025.

PRAYER in W.A.No.1721 of 2026: Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent to set aside the order dated 28.11.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.46509 of 2025.

For Appellant(s) Mr.S.Silambanan, Senior Counsel
in both appeals: for Mr.Nagarjun.S

For Respondent(s) Mr.P.V.Balasubramaniam
in both appeals: Additional Advocate General
 asst by Mr.Abishek Murthy
 Standing Counsel
 for R1 and R4

Mr.L.Gokulraj,
Addl Govt Pleader
for R2 and R3

COMMON JUDGMENT
(Delivered by the Hon'ble Chief Justice)

These intra-court appeals challenge the individual orders passed by the learned Single Judge dismissing W.P.No.31483 of 2025 and W.P.No.46509 of 2025. The appellants sought to halt eviction proceedings under the Tamil Nadu Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1975, and to set aside land acquisition proceedings initiated under the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of



W.A.No.3906 of 2025 etc.

Land for Industrial Purposes Act, 1997. As both the appeals concern the same properties and related transactions, we dispose of them through this common judgment.

2.1. The nub of the matter is that the State Government granted administrative sanction in G.O.Ms.No.3, Industries (SIPCOT-LA) Department, dated 06.01.2009, to acquire lands across Vadagal, Vallam and Budanur villages for expanding the SIPCOT Industrial Complex. Preliminary notifications were issued under Section 3(2) of the 1997 Act in February 2010.

2.2. The appellant company purchased 40,990 square feet of land across Survey Nos. 143/9, 143/8A, 145/6A, and 145/7A in Vadagal 'B' Village via a registered sale deed on 16.03.2011. The State published the final acquisition notice under Section 3(1) of the 1997 Act in G.O.Ms.Nos.156 and 158 on 29.11.2011.

2.3. The appellant company filed W.P.No.6993 of 2014 challenging the land acquisition. This Court directed the District Collector to consider the appellant's representation. Subsequently,



W.A.No.3906 of 2025 etc.

land compensation awards were determined and the funds were deposited in L.A.O.P.No.23 of 2025 before the Principal District Judge, Kancheepuram. Thereafter, the Estate authorities issued Form A and Form B notices under the 1975 Act, culminating in an eviction order dated 28.07.2025.

2.4. The learned Single Judge, vide order dated 24.11.2025, dismissed W.P.No.31483 of 2025, which was filed challenging the eviction order and dismissed W.P.No.46509 of 2025, which was filed challenging the acquisition notifications, vide order dated 28.11.2025, finding the acquisition valid and the transfer impermissible.

3.1. Learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the appellants contended that the appellants purchased the property on 16.03.2011, eight months before the final notification under Section 3(1) of the 1997 Act issued on 29.11.2011, and that the authorities concerned failed to serve personal notices under Section 3(2) of the 1997 Act or grant a personal hearing, breaching statutory requirements and the directions in W.P.No.6993 of 2014.



W.A.No.3906 of 2025 etc.

WEB COPY

3.2. He further submitted that the acquisition lapsed due to non-completion within statutory time-frames and any fresh acquisition, if required, must be carried out only under the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

4.1. Learned counsel for the respondents submitted that G.O.Ms.No.3 established administrative sanction in 2009, and preliminary notices under Section 3(2) of the 1997 Act were published in early 2010, whereas the appellants purchased the property when the land acquisition proceedings were underway, rendering the transfer invalid.

4.2. It is further submitted that in view of the notification issued under Section 3(1) of the 1997 Act, title vested absolutely in the State free from encumbrances and that the compensation was evaluated and funds were deposited with the competent civil court in L.A.O.P.No.23 of 2025. It is also submitted that continued occupation without title makes the appellants unauthorized



W.A.No.3906 of 2025 etc.

occupants under the 1975 Act.

WEB COPY

5. The records confirm that administrative sanction was granted in 2009 and preliminary notices under Section 3(2) of the 1997 Act were published in early 2010. The appellants purchased the land on 16.03.2011, well after acquisition proceedings had commenced. It is well-settled law that any transaction entered into after preliminary land acquisition notices are issued is void against the acquiring authority. A subsequent purchaser cannot challenge the acquisition proceedings or claim rights as an interested party beyond seeking compensation allocated to the original landowner.

6. Upon publication of the Gazette notice under Section 3(1) of the 1997 Act on 29.11.2011, the subject lands vested in the State free from all encumbrances. In fact, the appellants challenged the notification issued under Section 3(1) of the 1997 Act by filing W.P.No.6993 of 2014 and, as recorded in the order dated 24.9.2014, the appellants have restricted the prayer only qua consideration of representation. For ease of reference, the relevant portion of the said order reads thus:



"3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that he restricts his prayer and he would be satisfied, if his representation is directed to be considered."

The appellants having given up the challenge to the notification under Section 3(1) of the 1997 of the Act and restricted the relief only with regard to a direction to consider the representation, cannot now by way of subsequent writ petition raise the very same challenge to the notification under Section 3(1) of the 1997 Act.

7. We are of the view that the subsequent changes to revenue entries or obtaining local municipal approvals do not override statutory vesting of the land with the State. As the land belongs to the State for industrial expansion by SIPCOT, the continued occupancy by the appellants lacks legal standing. The eviction order issued, in our firm view, is sustainable.

8. The claim that the acquisition lapsed under the 2013 Act is untenable. The amount of compensation has been determined and deposited in L.A.O.P.No.23 of 2025 before the Principal District



W.A.No.3906 of 2025 etc.

Court, Kancheepuram. The appellant may approach the civil court to establish entitlement to compensation, but cannot resist eviction or overturn the completed land acquisition.

9. We find no error in the impugned orders passed by the learned Single Judge.

10. As a sequel, the writ appeals are dismissed and the orders of the learned Single Judge are affirmed. It is seen from the records that this court, vide order dated 16.12.2025, granted stay of dispossession of the appellants from the subject properties. The appellants are granted two weeks' time from the date of this judgment to peacefully vacate and hand over possession of the property to the respondents, failing which, as observed by the learned Single Judge, the respondent concerned shall take the assistance of jurisdictional police for evicting the appellants and taking over the possession. The appellants are at liberty to approach the Principal District Court, Kancheepuram, in L.A.O.P. No.23 of 2025 qua all the claims regarding the compensation in accordance with law.



W.A.No.3906 of 2025 etc.

WEB COPY

There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected interim applications stand closed.

(SUSHRUT ARVIND DHARMADHIKARI, CJ) (G.ARUL MURUGAN,J)
19.08.2026

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
sasi

To:

1. The Chairman and Managing Director
State Industries Promotion Corporation
of Tamil Nadu Limited (SIPCOT), 19-A,
Rukmani Lakshmipathi Road, Egmore,
Chennai - 600008.
2. The District Collector
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram-631 501.
3. The Special Tahsildar
Land Acquisition, Sriperumbudur Taluk,
Chennai-602 105.
4. The Estate Officer
SIPCOT Industrial Park, Vallam, Vadagal,
Sriperumbudur, Chennai-602 105.



WEB COPY



W.A.No.3906 of 2025 etc.

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
G.ARUL MURUGAN,J.

(sasi)

W.A.Nos.3906 of 2025 and 1721 of 2026

19.08.2026