

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 22.03.2017

Verdict on : 04.04.2017

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE M.M.SUNDRESH

W.P.Nos.29555, 29875, 31089, 32790 and 34917 of 2016
& W.M.P.Nos.25565, 25566, 25869, 25870, 26955, 26956, 28351,
28352, 30060 & 30061 of 2016

N.Sathish Kumar Petitioner in W.P.29555/2016

1.S.Anusuya

2.E.S.Sathish Kumar

3.E.S.Senthil Kumar

4.E.S.Rajan Petitioners in W.P.29875/2016

E.Jothi Krishnan Petitioner in W.P.31089/2016

P.Saroja Petitioner in W.P.32790/2016

Ganesan Petitioner in W.P.34917/2016

Vs.

1.The Secretary to Government
Industries Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St. George, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Chennai Metro Rail Limited,
Rep. By its Chairman, Administrative Office,
Chennai Metro Rail Depot,
Poonamallee High Road,
Koyambedu-600 107.

... R1 & R2 in all W.Ps

3.The Land Acquisition Officer/Revenue
Divisional Officer, Thondiarpeta,
Chennai-600 021.

... R3 in all W.Ps except
W.Ps.32790 & 34917 of 2016

4.The Land Acquisition Officer/Sub Collector,
The Chennai Metro Rail Ltd., Thondiarpeta,
Chennai-600 021.

... R3 in WP.32790 of 2016

5.The Land Acquisition Officer/Revenue
Divisional Officer,
The Chennai Metro Rail Ltd.,
Thondiarpet, Chennai-600 021.

... R3 in WP.34917 of 2016

Petition in W.P.No.29555 of 2016 is filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of certiorari to call for the records relating to the notice dt.1.7.2016 in Form E issued under Sec. 4 (2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act 1997 and the Notification dt.23.1.2016 issued under Sec. 3(2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act 1997 in so far as the lands of the petitioner of an extent of 1,180 sq.ft. in Block No.41 T.S. No. 2561 in Thondaiyarpur Village Chennai and quash the same.

Petition in W.P.No.29875 of 2016 is filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of certiorari Calling for the records relating to the Notice dated 1.7.2016 in Form E issued under Sec.4(2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act 1997 and the Notification dated 23.1.2016 issued under Sec.3(2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act 1997 in so far as the lands of the petitioners of an extent of 1,091 sq.ft. bearing Old Survey No.1717, R.S.No.2559 at Door No.31(Old No.40) Previous No.11 Ramanuja Iyer Street, Old Washermenpet, Chennai-21.

Petition in W.P.No.31089 of 2016 is filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of certiorari to call for the records relating to the notice dt.12.07.2016 in Form-E issued by the 3rd respondent under Sec. 4(2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act 1997 and the Notification dt.23.01.2016 issued by the 2nd respondent under Sec.3(2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act 1997 in so far as the lands of the petitioner of an extent of 1 763 sq.ft. in Block No.41 R.S.No.2563 (New R.S.No.2563/2) in Tondiarpet Village Chennai and quash the same.

Petition in W.P.No.32790 of 2016 is filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of certiorari to call for the records of the third respondent relating to the notice dated 29.08.2016 in Na.Ka.No.04/LA/CMRL/2016 and the notification dated 23.01.2016 issued by the 2nd respondent herein under Section 3(2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act, 1997 and quash the same insofar as it relates to the petitioner's land are concerned of an extent of 1335 sq.ft. and

building thereon in TS.No.2560, Block No.41 of Tondiarpet Village.

Petition in W.P.No.34917 of 2016 is filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying to issue a writ of certiorari to call for the records of the 3rd respondent herein relating to the notice dated 12.07.2016 and Notification dated 23.01.2016 issued by the 2nd respondent herein under section 3 (2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act 1997 and quash the same in so far as it relates to the petitioner's land are concerned of an extent of 200 sq.ft and building thereon in R.S.No.2566 Block No.41 within the registration district of North Chennai and Sub-Registration District of Royapuram of Tondiarpet Village.

For Petitioner : Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan, Senior Counsel,
in all W.Ps. for Mrs.AL.Ganthimathi

For Respondents : Mr.Mani Shankar,
in all W.Ps. Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.K.V.Dhanapalan,
Special Government Pleader
for R1 & R3

Mr.R.Thiagarajan, Senior Counsel,
for Mr.Jayesh B. Dolia for R2

COMMON ORDER

All these writ petitions have been filed challenging the notices issued in Form-E under Section 4(2) as well as the Notifications issued under Section 3(2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act, 1997, in respect of the lands owned by the petitioners' for the formation of Metro Railway Station, Tondiarpet.

2. As the issues sought to be raised being common, these writ petitions are disposed of through a common order.

3. After due compliance of Sections 3(1), 3(2) and 4(2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act, 1997, an award enquiry notice was issued to the petitioners. At that stage, these writ petitions have been filed.

4. The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 came into effect from 01.01.2014 (hereinafter called as "the Act 30 of 2013"). A comprehensive procedure has been prescribed under the Act. Section 103 of the Act 30 of 2013 shows that the

provisions are in addition to and not in derogation of, any other law for the time being in force. As per Section 105, the provisions of the Act 30 of 2013 are not to be applied in certain cases or to be applied with certain modifications. Sub Section (1) of Section 105 of the Act 30 of 2013 states that the Act shall not apply to the enactments relating to land acquisition specified in the Fourth schedule, subject to sub section (3). Sub section (3) of the Act 30 of 2013 mandates the Central Government through a notification, within one year from the date of the commencement of the Act, to apply any of the provisions of the Act relating to the determination of compensation in accordance with the First schedule and rehabilitation and resettlement specified in the Second and Third Schedules, being beneficial to the affected families, shall apply to the cases of land acquisition under the enactments specified in the Fourth Schedule.

5. Thus, sub section (1) deals with enactments specified in the Fourth Schedule to whom the provisions of the Act 30 of 2013 shall not apply, of course subject to sub section (3) which deals with issues pertaining to compensation rehabilitation and resettlement. To put with clarity, the enactments mentioned in the Fourth Schedule would proceed on their own provisions except issues governing compensation rehabilitation and resettlement available under Section 30 of 2013, which are more beneficial to the land owners. It is apposite to extract Section 105 of the Act 30 of 2013.

"105. Provisions of this Act not to apply in certain cases or to apply with certain modifications:- (1) Subject to sub-section (3), the provisions of this Act shall not apply to the enactments relating to land acquisition specified in the Fourth Schedule.

(2) Subject to sub-section (2) of Section 106, the Central Government may, by notification, omit or add to any of the enactments specified in the Fourth Schedule.

(3) The Central Government shall, by notification, within one year from the date of commencement of this Act, direct that any of the provisions of this act relating to the determination of compensation in accordance with the First Schedule and rehabilitation and resettlement specified in the Second and Third Schedules, being beneficial to the affected families, shall apply to the cases of land acquisition under the enactments specified in the Fourth Schedule or shall apply with such exceptions or modifications that do not reduce the compensation or dilute

the provisions of this Act relating to compensation or rehabilitation and resettlement as may be specified in the notification, as the case may be.

(4) A copy of every notification proposed to be issued under sub-section (3), shall be laid in draft before each House of Parliament, while it is in session, for a total period of thirty days which may be comprised in one session or in two or more successive sessions, and if, before the expiry of the session immediately following the session or the successive sessions aforesaid, both Houses agree in disapproving the issue of the notification or both Houses agree in making any modification in the notification, the notification shall not be issued or, as the case may be, shall be issued only in such modified form as may be agreed upon by both the Houses of Parliament."

6. On the same line, Act 1 of 2015 has been brought forth by the Government of Tamil Nadu by inserting Section 105(A) creating a Fifth Schedule for certain other enactments including Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act, 1997.

"105-A. Provisions of this Act not to apply to certain Tamil Nadu Acts or to apply with certain modifications.-(1) Subject to sub-section (2), the provisions of this Act shall not apply to the enactments relating to land acquisition specified in the Fifth Schedule. (2) The State Government shall, by notification, within one year from the date of commencement of this Act, direct that any of the provisions of this Act, relating to the determination of compensation in accordance with the First Schedule and rehabilitation and resettlement specified in the Second and Third Schedules, being beneficial to the affected families, shall apply to the cases of land acquisition under the enactments specified in the Fifth Schedule or shall apply with such exceptions or modifications that do not reduce the compensation or dilute the provisions of this Act relating to compensation or rehabilitation and resettlement as may be specified in the notification, as the case may be."

7. Since a notification has not been issued by the Government of Tamil Nadu, an order was passed in G.O.Ms.No.251, Industries (SIPCOT-LA) Department dated 31.12.2014 extending the benefits qua the compensation, rehabilitation and resettlement under Act 30 of 2013 to the acquisition made under Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industries Purposes Act, 1997. These are the relevant passages governing the Government Order.

"4. Accordingly, pending assent, to provide fair compensation, rehabilitation and resettlement, the Government have now decided that the provisions of Central Act 30 of 2013 relating to determination of compensation in accordance with the First Schedule and rehabilitation and resettlement specified in the Second and Third Schedules being beneficial to the affected families, shall apply to the cases of land acquisition where the notice under Section 3(2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Land for Industrial Purposes Act, 1997, published on or after 1.1.2014."

8. In tune with the Government Order aforesaid, it is agreed on principle by all the respondents that pending notification, the acquisition made in the present cases would be governed by the Act 30 of 2013 for the purpose of compensation as in the case of other enactments mentioned in the Fourth Schedule.

9. The project went on. The sketch shown by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the second respondent would show that over and above 90% of the work has been completed except the lands, which are the subject matter of these writ petitions.

10. The learned Senior counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that as per Section 105(A)(2) of Act 30 of 2013 when there is no notification available under Section sub clause II then even the exemption provided under sub Clause I also would go. As there is repugnancy between the Central and State enactments, Article 254 (i) of the Constitution of India would come into play. In support of his contention, the learned Senior Counsel has made reliance upon the decision rendered by this Court in R. MOORTHY AND 28 OTHERS V. STATE OF TAMIL NADU, REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, HIGHWAYS AND MINOR PORTS DEPARTMENT, CHENNAI AND NINE OTHERS (2014 (2) CWC 763).

11. The learned Senior counsel appearing for the second respondent and the learned Advocate General appearing for respondents 1 and 3 would submit that Sub Sections 1 and 2 of

Section 105-A of Act 1 of 2015 are distinct and different. It has been agreed between the respondents that the benefits of Act 30 of 2013 insofar as the compensation would be extended to the case of the petitioners in view of the Government Order passed in G.O.Ms.No. 251, Industries (SIPCOT-LA) Department, dated 31.12.2014. The project, which is of the paramount public interest, is nearing completion. The petitioners participated in the proceedings. As notices under Section 4(2) of the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act, 1997, are issued already, vesting takes place. The petitioners cannot have a grievance in view of an application of the beneficial provision qua the compensation under Section 30 of 2013. Under Section 114 of the Act 30 of 2013, the Land Acquisition Act 1894 stood repealed. Sections 6 and 7 coming under Chapter-III, Tamil Nadu Act 10 of 1999 deals with determination and payment of compensation amount. As per Section 7(6) of the said Act, the Collector is required to be guided by the provisions contained in Sections 23 and 24 and other relevant provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. Thus, despite the repealing of Central Act 1 of 1894, Chapter III of Tamil Nadu Act 10 of 1999 with specific reference to Sections 6 and 7 are not repealed by necessary implication.

12. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the second respondent would submit that in any case, the petitioners' cases would not come under rehabilitation or resettlement, as there is no mass displacement of the livelihood involved. Thus, the petitioners' interest are sufficiently protected and in view of Act 1 of 2015, there is no basis for the writ petitions filed.

13. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioners, by way of reply to the arguments made, submits that in view of the repealing of Central Act 1 of 1894, there is no provision for compensation under Tamil Nadu Act 10 of 1999 as well, and thus, the entire proceedings are void.

14. As discussed above, Sub Sections 1 and 3 of Section 105-A of the Act 1 of 2015 are distinct and different. If one reads Sub Section (1), there is no doubt that it exempts the enactments relating to land acquisition specified in the Fifth Schedule. Admittedly, the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act, 1997, comes under Fifth Schedule. The only exemption that is given is with respect to the provisions which are not made applicable to the enactments relating to the land Acquisition specified in the Fifth Schedule is to the contingency specified under Sub Section 2. Thus, when the provision dealing with the compensation, rehabilitation and resettlement under Act 30 of 2013 is beneficial and gives more succour to a land owner divested with the land than the one provided under the enactments mentioned in the Fifth Schedule,

then such a provision will have to be applied notwithstanding an acquisition made under those enactments. As there is no dispute that the provisions governing compensation under Act 30 of 2013 are more beneficial than the one provided under the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Land for Industrial Purposes 1997, a notification is sought to be made as mandated under Section 105-A sub clause 2 of Act 1 of 2015. Therefore, sub clause 2 of Section 105-A of the Act 1 of 2015, in specific terms, deals with the factors mentioned therein and thus, has got no direct connection with the "acquisition of land" under the Acts mentioned in the Fifth Schedule as such. In the case on hand, it is not necessary to go into the issue pertaining to the non-publication of the notification since the respondents have agreed to grant the benefit. Suffice it is to state that even assuming that a notification has not been issued and published by the State Government, that by itself will not set at naught or nullify the acquisition made.

15. There is no repugnance involved. This is for the reason, Section 105-A of the Act 1 of 2015 itself gives a clearance for an acquisition under the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Lands for Industrial Purposes Act, 1997. Though under Section 114 of the Act 30 of 2013, the Land Acquisition Act, 1894(1 of 1894) has been repealed, the provisions of compensation available under the Tamil Nadu Act 10 of 1999, under Section 7(6) would not become inoperative. This provision as rightly submitted by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the second respondent is a piece of legislation by incorporation. Thus, even though the provision contained under Sections 23 and 24 and other relevant provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 are made applicable to determine the compensation amount under Section 7 of Tamil Nadu Act 10 of 1999, the said section shall continue to be in statute. To put it otherwise, repealing of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 would not have any bearing on the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Act 10 of 1999, though certain provisions of the earlier Act have been borrowed into it. This position of law has been held way back in the year 1963 in RAM SARUP V. MUNSHI AND OTHERS (AIR 1963 Supreme Court 553) the following is fruitful recapitulation of relevant passage.

"(1) Definition of 'agricultural land' under S.3(1): Where the provisions of an Act are incorporated by reference in a later Act the repeal of the earlier Act has, in general, no effect upon the construction or effect of the Act in which its provisions have been incorporated. The effect of incorporation is stated by Brett, L. J., in Clarke v. Bradlugh, (1881) 8 QBD 63.

"Where a statute is incorporated, by reference, into a second statute the

repeal of the first statute by a third does not affect the second."

In the circumstances, therefore, the repeal of the Punjab Alienation of Land Act of 1900 has no effect on the continued operation of the Preemption Act and the expression 'agricultural land' in the later Act has to be read as if the definition in the Alienation of Land Act had been bodily transposed into it."

Therefore, the contention of the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner that there is neither a provision for compensation under Tamil Nadu Act 10 of 1999 nor under Act 30 of 2013 available to the petitioners and thus, the entire land acquisition proceedings would become nullity, cannot be sustained in the eye of law.

16. After the arguments were concluded and the order was dictated, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner has made a mention before this Court and produced the following judgments:

1. SOUTH INDIA CORPORATION (P) LTD., V. SECRETARY, BOARD OF REVENUE, TRIVANDRUM (AIR (1964) 4 Supreme Court 207);
2. PUNJAB SIKH REGULAR MOTOR SERVICE V. REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY (AIR (1966) Supreme Court 1318);
3. CHANDAVARKAR SITA RATNA RAO V. ASHALATA S. GURAM ((1986) 4 Supreme Court Cases 447); and
4. K.T. PLANTATION PRIVATE LIMITED AND ANOTHER V. STATE OF KARNATAKA ((2011) 9 Supreme Court Cases 1).

17. These judgments have been produced after duly noticing the counsel for the respondents.

18. The judgments produced do not help the case of the petitioner. In SOUTH INDIA CORPORATION (P) LTD., V. SECRETARY, BOARD OF REVENUE, TRIVANDRUM (AIR (1964) 4 Supreme Court 207), the Honourable Apex Court was dealing with the constitutional provisions containing under Articles 277, 278 and 372 of the Constitution of India. It was held that Article 372 being subject to the other provisions of the Constitution is also subject to Article 278, which opens out with a non obstante clause "notwithstanding anything in the Constitution".

19. In PUNJAB SIKH REGULAR MOTOR SERVICE V. REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY (AIR (1966) Supreme Court 1318), the interpretation was with respect to Central Provinces and Berar

Motor Vehicles Rules, 1940, and Section 63(1) of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939. Taking into consideration of opening part of sub Section 1 of Section 63 "except as may be otherwise prescribed", it was held that in view of Clause a of Rule 62, which provides "subject to the provisions of Rule 63" it was held that the said Rule 63 must supersede the direction contained under Section 63(1) of the statute. Such a situation is not available in the present case as there is no apparent conflict between the Act and the Rules. In the said case, a harmonious construction was made by rightly interpreting the provisions. Thus, the said decision does not have any application.

20. In CHANDAVARKAR SITA RATNA RAO V. ASHALATA S. GURAM ((1986) 4 Supreme Court Cases 447), the Apex Court was dealing with the intention of the legislation and thus, not to amend what is actually expressed, especially when the language is plain and admits of only one meaning. Therefore, it has been further held that the expression "notwithstanding" is in contra distinction to the phrase 'subject to'. Thus, the words "subject to" would mean a provision yielding place to another provision to which it is made subject. The following paragraph of the said decision would be apposite.

"68. It is well settled that the expression "notwithstanding" is in contradistinction to the phrase "subject to", the latter conveying the idea of a provision yielding place to another provision or other provisions to which it is made subject. This will be clarified in the instant case by comparison of sub-section (1) of Section 15 with sub section (1) of Section 15-A."

Therefore, this Court is of the view that the said decision would in fact militate against the contention sought to be raised by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner.

21. In K.T. PLANTATION PRIVATE LIMITED AND ANOTHER V. STATE OF KARNATAKA ((2011) 9 Supreme Court Cases 1), the issue was with respect to the interpretation of Section 107 and 110 of the Land Reforms Act. For the better appreciation, both the provisions are reproduced hereunder.

"53. Section 107 states that the provisions of the Act would not apply to certain lands mentioned therein, but made subject to the provisions of Section 110. Section 107, to the extent it is relevant for the purpose, is extracted below for easy reference:

"107. Act not to apply to certain lands.- (1) Subject to the provisions of

xxx
xxx

(vi) used for the
cultivation of linaloe;

xxx
xxx

(3) In respect of every acquisition contrary to sub-section (2), the provisions of Section 66 to 76 shall mutatis mutandis apply."

"110. Certain lands to be not exempt from certain provisions.- The State Government may, by notification direct that any land referred to in [Section 107 and 108] shall not be exempt from such of the provisions of this Act from which they have been exempted under the said sections."

64. Section 110 of the Land Reforms Act empowers the State Government to withdraw the exemption granted to any land referred to in Sections 107 and 108. Section 107 itself has been made "subject to" Section 110 of the Act. The words 'subject to' conveys the idea of a provision yielding place to another provision or other provisions to which it is made subject.

"Subject to--Liable, subordinate, subservient, inferior, obedient to:

governed or effected by; provided that;
provided; answerable for."

66. Since Section 107 is made subject to Section 110, the former section conveys the idea of yielding to the provision to which it is made subject that is Section 110 which is the will of legislature. Reference may be made to the decisions of this Court in Punjab Sikh Regular Motor Service, Moudhapara, Raipur v. Regional Transport Authority & Another AIR 1966 SC 1318, Joginder Singh & Others v. Deputy Custodian-General of Evacuee Property & Others AIR 1967 SC 145 and Bharat Hari Singhania & Others v. Commissioner of Wealth Tax (Central) & Others (1994) Supp. 3 SCC 46, Ashok Leyland Ltd. v. State of T.N. & Another (2004) 3 SCC 1, Printers (Mysore) Ltd. v. M. A. Rasheed & Others (2004) 4 SCC 460, South India Corporation (P) Ltd. v. Secretary, Board of Revenue, Trivendrum & Another AIR 1964 SC 207, Commissioner of Wealth Tax, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad v. Trustees of H.E.H. Nizam's Family (Remainder Wealth Trust), Hyderabad (1977) 3 SCC 362 and Chandavarkar Sita Ratna Rao v. Ashalata S. Guram (1986) 4 SCC 447.

67. The Legislature's apathy in granting exemption for lands used for cultivation of Linaloe is discernible from the language used in sub-section (2) of Section 107, which says that no person shall after the commencement of the Amendment Act acquire in any manner for the cultivation of Linaloe, land of an extent which together with the land cultivated by Linaloe, if any, already held by him exceeds ten units. Legislature, therefore, as matter of policy, wanted to give only a conditional exemption for lands used for Linaloe cultivation and the policy was to empower the State Government to withdraw the same especially when the law is that no person can claim exemption as a matter of right. The legislative will was to make Section 107 subject to Section 110 and not the will of the delegate, hence, overriding effect has to be given to Section 110. Further, the Land Reforms Act including Section 110 was placed in IXth Schedule in the year 1965 and, hence, immune from challenge in a court of law."

Thus, the ratio laid down in the aforesaid judgments also supports the case of the respondents.

23. One has to see the public interest as well, though this Court is aware that an Act meant for acquisition is expropriatory. The project is stated to be stalled though substantial work has been completed. Hence, looking from any perspective, this Court does not find any merits in these writ petitions and accordingly, the same stand dismissed. However, it is made clear that in view of the categorical stand taken by the respondents, the petitioners are entitled for the benefits qua the compensation among other things, if any, under the Act 30 of 2013. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are also dismissed.

After pronouncing the order, the learned Senior counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the compensation as mandated under Section 38 of Act 30 of 2013, has to be paid by the respondents and till such time, the possession of the petitioner need not be disturbed.

2. The learned Senior counsel appearing for the second respondent submits that the compensation, as per Act 30 of 2013 for the lands acquired, would be paid, within a period of two weeks from the date of such determination.

3. The said submission is hereby recorded and accordingly, it is made clear that on payment of compensation determined, the District Collector shall take possession as per Section 38 of Act 30 of 2013. It is further made clear that this order will not stand in the way of the petitioner challenging the same in a manner known to law.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS VIII)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

raa

To

1.The Secretary to Government
Industries Department,
Government of Tamil Nadu,
Fort St. George, Secretariat,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The Chairman,
Chennai Metro Rail Limited,
Administrative Office,
Chennai Metro Rail Depot,
Poonamallee High Road,
Koyambedu-600 107.

3.The Land Acquisition Officer/Revenue
Divisional Officer, Thondiarpet,
Chennai-600 021.

4.The Land Acquisition Officer/Sub Collector,
The Chennai Metro Rail Ltd., Thondiarpet,
Chennai-600 021.

5.The District Collector,
Chennai.

6.The Land Acquisition Officer/Revenue
Divisional Officer,
The Chennai Metro Rail Ltd.,
Thondiarpet, Chennai-600 021.

+1cc to Mr.Jayesh B.Dolia, Advocate, S.R.No.20444

+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.20837

W.P.Nos.29555, 29875, 31089, 32790
and 34917 of 2016

SKV(CO)
CA(13/04/2017)

सत्यमेव जयते
WEB COPY