



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 16.11.2021

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.M. SUBRAMANIAM

W.P.No.15480 of 2011

&

M.P.Nos.2 & 3 of 2011

Kalaiman Chemicals Pvt Ltd.,
Rep. by its Director Mr.Jamal Mohamed,
Regd. Office: Kalaiman Building,
T.S.No.3854, South 2nd Street,
Pudukottai - 622 001.

...Petitioner

Vs.

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

2.The Principal Secretary and
Commissioner of Land Administration,
Chepauk, Chennai - 600 005.

3.The District Collector,
Nagapattinam, District,
Nagapattinam,

4.The District Revenue Officer,
Nagapattinam District,
Nagapattinam.

5.The Tahsildar,
Vedaranyam Taluk,
Vedaranyam Post,
Nagapattinam District.

6.The District Forest Officer,
Nagapattinam District,
Nagapattinam

...Respondents

Prayer:Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, to call for the records of the the 2nd respondent in Roc.No.T2/12017/10 dt.03.06.2011 in confirming the 3rd respondent's order dt.30.05.2009 vide proceedings No.Roc.F3/14473/06 and quash the same consequently direct the 1st respondent to consider lease application dt. 14.05.1991 for



grant of lease to manufacture salt in the village of Panchanathikulam, Naduchetti, Vedaranyam Taluk, Nagapattinam District.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.M.R.Jothimanian
For Respondents : Mr.Selvaraj
Additional Government Pleader

O R D E R

The order of the 2nd respondent dated 03.06.2011 confirming the order of the 3rd respondent dated 30.05.2009 is under challenge in the present writ petition. The direction sought for is to consider the lease application dated 14.05.1991.

2. A plain reading of the relief reveals that direction is sought for to consider the lease application submitted by the petitioner on 14.05.1991 and the writ petition was filed in the year 2011. At this length of time, the said direction to consider the lease application of the year 1991 cannot be considered. The permission granted for manufacturing salt was cancelled and the appeal filed by the petitioner was also rejected in the year 2011. Thus, the manufacturing process is not continuing for the past many years.

3. Under these circumstances, the learned counsel for the petitioner made a submission that the application submitted by the petitioner in the year 1991 has to be considered.

4. This Court is of the considered opinion that on account of efflux of time, such a direction need not be granted. However, the petitioner may submit a fresh application to the respondent for grant of such permission. Accordingly, the petitioner is at liberty to submit a fresh application, if they are eligible for the purpose of getting permission from the respondent. In the event of filing of such application, the same shall be considered on merits and in accordance with law and decision has to be taken as expeditiously as possible.

5. With these observations, this Writ Petition stands disposed of. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are also closed. No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CCC)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

shr/kan



To

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

2.The Principal Secretary and
Commissioner of Land Administration,
Chepauk, Chennai - 600 005.

3.The District Collector,
Nagapattinam, District,
Nagapattinam,

4.The District Revenue Officer,
Nagapattinam District,
Nagapattinam.

5.The Tahsildar,
Vedaranyam Taluk,
Vedaranyam Post,
Nagapattinam District.

6.The District Forest Officer,
Nagapattinam District,
Nagapattinam

+1cc to Mr.M.R.Jothimanian, Advocate, S.R.No.59146

+1cc to the Government Pleader, S.R.No.59057

W.P.No.15480 of 2011

PCH(CO)
RGA(01/12/2021)