

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22.10.2019

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE DR.VINEET KOTHARI, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE  
AND  
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.SARAVANAN

W.A.No.1746 of 2012  
and  
C.M.P.No. 22542 of 2017

Jayaraman

... Appellant

-vs-

The Special Tahsildar  
Jayankondam Lignite  
Power Project  
Jayankondam  
Ariyalur District.

... Respondent

Prayer:- Writ Appeal filed under Clause 15 of Letter Patent Act, to set aside the order dated 06.06.2011 passed in W.P.No.11438 of 2011.

Prayer in W.P.No.11438 of 2011:

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India Praying for issuance of a Writ of Mandamus Call for the records pertaining to the order made in Na.Ka.A/13A/98 dated 21.06.2006 passed by the respondent and quash the same and consequently directing the respondent to refer the case in respect of the claim over the title of the house property situated in SF No.64/6A 64/6B under Section 30 of Land Acquisition Act.

For Petitioner

: Mr.P.Nagaraju

For Respondents

: Mr.Kamlesh Kannan  
Government Advocate

O R D E R

(Order of the Court was made by The Hon'ble Acting Chief Justice)

This Writ Appeal is filed as against the order dated 06.06.2011 passed by the learned Single Judge in W.P.No.11438 of 2011 whereby the learned Single Judge inspite of granting relief to the present petitioner as prayed for has permitted him to make representation to the respondent setting out his claim with all supporting legal documents and the respondent was directed to consider the same and also inform the petitioner the status of his claim. Paragraph 3 of the order dated 06.06.2011 is quoted below for ready reference:

"3. In such view of the matter, this court is not inclined to grant the relief as prayed for except to permit the petitioner to make a proper representation to the respondent setting out his claim with all supporting legal documents and the same will be considered by the respondent and the petitioner will also be duly informed about the status of his claim. This writ petition stands disposed of accordingly. No costs."

2. Having heard the learned counsels appearing on either side we are satisfied that no interference in the impugned order is called for since the petitioner was permitted to make representation along with relevant evidence. Therefore, if the petitioner not secured the benefit he can make another representation to the respondent setting out his claim.

3. With the above observations, this Writ Appeal is disposed of. No costs.

WEB COPY

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar(CS)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

arr

To

The Special Tahsildar  
Jayankondam Lignite  
Power Project  
Jayankondam  
Ariyalur District.


+1cc to Mr.Vijayan , Advocate SR.No. 88468

+1 cc to Government Pleader Sr.No. 88766

+1cc to Mr.C.Pugalenthil , Advocate SR.No. 88853

W.A.No.1746 of 2012

A.SK(25/11/2019)



WEB COPY