



Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.11.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011,
M.P.No.2 of 2011 and W.M.P.Nos.12919 and 24762 of 2016

Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016:-

S.Sarojini,
Anupam Foundations,
New No.9/11/G-4,
Old No.5/2, Ramapuram Street,
Saidapet(west),
Chennai 600 015

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. P.Kumaravel Pandian,
Managing Director,
State Industrial Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu,
Registered Office,
19/A, Rukmani Lakshmipathy Road,
Egmore,
Chennai - 600 008.

2. Muthu,
Special Tahsildar (L.A),
SIPCOT, TACID Division,
Oragadam Scheme,
Irunkattu Kottai,
Sriperumbudur.



Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011

3. Ramasamy,
Senior Project Manager,
Project Administration Office,
SIPCOT Industrial Park,
Oragadam, Padappai,
Chennai - 601 301.

... Respondents

W.P.No.28709 of 2007:-

S.Sarojini

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. The Tashildar,
Land Acquisition (Oragadam Project),
SIPCOT Industrial Park,
Irunkattu Kottai,
Sri Perumpudur - 602105.
2. The Chairman / Director,
State Industrial Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu,
Registered Office:
19/A, Rukmani Lakshimipathy Road,
Egmore,
Chennai - 600 008.
3. The Secretary to Government,
Industries Department,
Fort St.George,
Chennai - 600 009.
4. The District Revenue Officer (L.A),
SIPCOT (TACID Division),
Tambaram,
Chennai - 600 045.
5. The Special Commissioner,
Land Administration (Oragadam Project),
(SIPCOT Industrial Park),
Industries Department,
Chepauk (Ezhilagam),
Chennai - 600 005.



Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011

WEB COPY

6. S.Rajeswari W/o Sundaravadivelan,
Representing as Power of Attorney for
(i) Moongili w/o Arumugam
(ii) Murugan s/o Arumugam
(iii) Kishtan s/o Arumugam
No.9, Masilamani Mudali Street,
T.Nagar, Chennai - 600 017.

7. T.Ramamurthi S/o Thangavel Pillai,
Representing as Power of Attorney for
(i) Rani w/o Chinnappan
(ii) Thangaraj s/o Chinnappan
(iii) Murugan s/o Chinnappan
(iv) Ganesan s/o Kullan
Mathur Village,
Sri Perumpudur,
Kanchipuram District.

... Respondents

W.P.No.6600 of 2011:-

S.Sarojini

... Petitioner

-Vs-

1. The Managing Director,
State Industrial Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu,
Registered Office,
19/A, Rukmani Lakshmipathy Road,
Egmore,
Chennai - 600 008.

2. The Special Thasildar (L.A),
SIPCOT,
TACID Division,
Oragadam Scheme,
Irunkattu Kottai,
Sriperumpudur.

3. The Senior Project Manager,
Project Administration Office,

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



WEB COPY

Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011

SIPCOT Industrial Park,
Oragadam,
Padappai,
Chennai - 601 301.

4. The Secretary to Government,
Industries Department,
St.George Fort,
Chennai - 600 009.
(R4 impleaded as per order
dated 31.07.2017 in
W.M.P.No.6703 of 2017
in W.P.No.6600 of 2011)
5. M/s Apollo Infrastructure Projects Finance
Company Pvt. Ltd,
Mathur Village, Oragadam,
Sriperumbudur Taluk,
Kancheepuram District.
(R5 impleaded as per order
dated 18.08.2017 in
W.M.P.No.31026 of 2016
in W.P.No.6600 of 2011)
6. M/s Zetek Castings P Ltd.,
Plot No.33, SIDCO Industrial Estate,
Thirumudivakkam,
Chennai - 600 044.
(R6 impleaded as per order
dated 14.09.2017 in
W.M.P.No.26199 of 2017 in
W.P.No.6600 of 2011)

.... Respondents

Prayer in Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016 :- Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of the Contempt of Courts Act, to punish the respondents who willfully disobeyed the order dated 13.06.2016 in W.M.P.No.12919 of 2016 in W.P.No.6600 of 2011 and direct the respondents to remove the superstructure in my property.



Prayer in W.P.No.28709 of 2007:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to issue to the petitioner, the patta in respect of the property of an extent of Acre 1.56 cents bonafidely purchased by her from the sixth and seventh respondents, being the Power Agents of the petitioner's vendors, by way of a Sale Deed dated 14.12.2005, in Old Survey No.375, New Survey No.375/1 in the Mathur Village, Registered as Document No: 11126 of 2005 with the Sub-Registrar Office at Sriperumpudur and within the Registration district of Kanchipuram.

Prayer in W.P.No.6600 of 2011:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the issuance of a Writ of Declaration, declaring that the Award No.02 of 2001 passed by the third respondent through his proceedings in Na.Ka.24/98/aa dated 05.10.2001 with respect to Survey No.375/1 (Old Survey No.375), Mathur Village, Sriperumpudur Taluk, Kancheepuram District to an extent of 1 acre 56 cents land is null and void and not binding upon the petitioner.

In Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Karunakaran
For R1 and R3 : M/s.Sudarshana Sunder
For R2 : Mr.A.Selvendran
Special Government Pleader

In W.P.No.28709 of 2007

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Karunakaran
For R1, R3, R4
and R5 : Mr.A.Selvendran
Special Government Pleader
For R2 : M/s.Sudarshana Sunder



WEB COPY

Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011

For R6 : Dismissed vide order dated
15.11.2010.

In W.P.No.6600 of 2011

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Karunakaran
For R1 and R3 : M/s.Sudarshana Sunder
For R2 and R4 : Mr.A.Selvendran
Special Government Pleader
For R6 : Mr.Karthikeyan

COMMON ORDER

The Contempt petition in Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016 has been filed, to punish the respondents who willfully disobeyed the order dated 13.06.2016 in W.M.P.No.12919 of 2016 in W.P.No.6600 of 2011 and direct the respondents to remove the superstructure in my property.

2. The writ petition in W.P.No.28709 of 2007 has been filed, to direct the respondents to issue to the petitioner, the patta in respect of the property of an extent of Acre 1.56 cents bonafidely purchased by her from the sixth and seventh respondents, being the Power Agents of the petitioner's vendors, by way of a Sale Deed dated 14.12.2005, in Old Survey No.375, New Survey No.375/1 in the Mathur Village, Registered as Document No: 11126 of 2005 with the Sub-Registrar Office at Sriperumpudur and within the Registration district of Kanchipuram.



3. The writ petition in W.P.No.6600 of 2011 has been filed, to declare that the Award No.02 of 2001 passed by the third respondent through his proceedings in Na.Ka.24/98/aa dated 05.10.2001 with respect to Survey No.375/1 (Old Survey No.375), Mathur Village, Sriperumpudur Taluk, Kancheepuram District to an extent of 1 acre 56 cents land is null and void and not binding upon the petitioner.

4. Heard, the learned counsel on both sides.

5. The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner purchased the property comprised in Old Survey No.375, New Survey No.375/1, in Mathur Village, Sriperumpudur Taluk, Kancheepuram District, to an extent to 1 Acre and 56 cents from Moongili wife of Arumugam, Murugan son of Arumugam and Kishtan son of Arumugam, through their Power Agent, S.Rajeswari and Rani wife of Chinnappan, Thangaraj son of Chinnappan, Murugan son of Chinnappan and Ganesan son of Kullan through their Power Agent T.Ramamurthi, by the registered sale deed, dated 14.12.2005 registered vide Document No.11126 of 2005. Even before the purchase of the subject property, the Government of Tamil Nadu through G.O.Ms.No.125, Ind. (MII) Department, dated 09.05.1997 had accorded Administrative Sanction for acquisition of lands to an extent of 638.88.0 hectares of dry lands and to an extent of 190.34.0 hectares of Poramboke



lands in Oragadam and 8 other villages in Sriperumpudur Taluk, Kanchipuram District for setting up of industrial complex by SIPCOT.

However, some of the land owners sought for exclusion of their respective lands and hence, the Government of Tamil Nadu by its Letter, dated 30.12.1998, had informed to send a consolidated exclusion proposal and accordingly, the District Revenue Officer (LA), Tambaram through his letter, dated 09.04.1999, had proposed for exclusion of properties.

6. Thereafter, the SIPCOT had sent a letter, dated 19.06.2000 to the Government, requesting the Government of Tamil Nadu to issue a Government order deleting such extent of lands from acquisition. As per the said proposal, the subject land was excluded from acquisition. However, on 06.04.2009 the fifth and sixth respondents in W.P.No.6600 of 2011, were trying to interfere with the peaceful possession and enjoyment of the subject land. Therefore, the petitioner filed a writ petition in W.P.No.6757 of 2009 for direction, directing the respondents 1 to 3 not to allot any portion of the subject land to any third party. In the said writ petition, the SIPCOT has filed a counter and stated that the subject land has not been excluded and award has been passed in respect of the subject land. Therefore, the said writ petition was withdrawn with a liberty to challenge the award, dated 05.10.2001.



WEB COPY

7. On the strength of the sale deed, dated 14.12.2005, the petitioner applied for Patta and it was not considered and as such the petitioner filed a writ petition in W.P.No.28709 of 2007, for direction, directing the respondents to issue Patta for the subject land. Insofar as the contempt petition is concerned, the respondents violated the interim order granted by this Court and the petitioner has filed a contempt petition in Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, to punish the respondents for willful disobedience of the order passed by this Court.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the subject land had been wrongly included in the award, since, already the subject land has been excluded by the proceedings of the first respondent, in W.P.No.6600 of 2011, dated 19.06.2000. The encumbrance certificate does not reflect any encumbrance with regard to the award. The possession of the property is very well with the petitioner and in fact, while admitting the writ petition, this Court granted an interim injunction restraining the respondents 5 and 6 in W.P.No.6600 of 2011, not to put up any construction in the subject land. Thereafter, it was modified to maintain the Status Quo, since, they started construction in the subject property. He further submitted that so far no compensation amount was paid to the petitioner's



vendors or any other interested persons in respect of the subject property.

Even then, the fifth and sixth respondents in W.P.No.6600 of 2011, continued their construction and as such they are liable to be punished.

9. Per contra, the respondents 1, 3, 4 and 5 in W.P.No.28709 of 2007, filed counter and Mr.A.Selvendran, learned Special Government Pleader, submitted that the Government of Tamil Nadu have accorded sanction for acquisition of 636.88.0 hectares of dry Patta land under the urgency provision of Section 17(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and for an extent of 190.34.0 hectares of Government Poramboke lands in Oragadam, Panapakkam, Mathur, Karanithangal villages and Panruti of Sriperumbudur Taluk, Kancheepuram District, for the purpose of setting up of SIPCOT Oragadam Industrial Growth Centre by Tamil Nadu Corporation for Industrial Infrastructure Development Limited, which was later on merged with State Industrial Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu in respect of the land comprised in Survey No.375/1, situated in Mathur village forms part of the total extent of the land and covered with Administrative Sanction.

10. The notification under Section 4 (1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 by the G.O.Ms.No.503, dated 24.06.1999, published in the Tamil Nadu Government Gazette. The said notification has been published



Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011

invoking the emergency provision under Section 17(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and the enquiry under Section 5 (A) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 was dispensed with. The draft declaration under Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 was approved by the Government in G.O.Ms.No.747, Industries Department, dated 07.10.1999. The draft declaration under Section 7 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 was approved on 20.01.2000 and the award enquiry was conducted on 23.08.2001 and 24.08.2001. The Award was passed in Award No.02 of 2001 on 05.10.2001 for the extent of 8.30.5 hectares including the subject property. The possession of the property had been taken over and handed over to the SIPCOT on 19.03.2003. Therefore, the entire acquisition proceedings was completed as early as in the year 2003 itself.

11. In respect of the subject land, it was developed by the SIPCOT to an extent of 2.48 acres of land comprised in Plot No.B-31 was allotted in favour of the fifth respondent in W.P.No.6600 of 2011, by the Allotment order, dated 18.08.2008, which includes the subject land comprised in Survey No.375 (part). The possession of the subject property was handed over to the fifth respondent in W.P.No.6600 of 2011 on 08.12.2008. During the course of acquisition, it was proposed to exclude certain pieces of Patta and Poramboke lands from acquisition and accordingly the proposal dated



19.06.2000 were sent to the Government for deletion of 23.93.0 hectares of Patta lands from acquisition in which 1.51.0 hectares comprised in Survey No.375 was also included.

12. However, by the communication, dated 26.11.2001, the second respondent in W.P.No.6600 of 2011 informed to the first respondent in W.P.No.6600 of 2011, that in respect of the subject land and other lands which were under the proposal for deletion, the award was passed on 05.10.2001. Therefore, by the communication, dated 12.12.2001, the proposal for deletion of certain lands were returned and directed to delete those lands from the schedule of deletion proposal. As per the award, dated 05.10.2001, the compensation for the subject land was duly paid to the petitioner's vendors' predecessors. It is also evident from the records produced by the respondents and proved the same. In fact, they were also duly served with the notice under Section 12(2) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, after the award. The records further revealed that the land delivery receipt produced by the respondents, dated 19.03.2003, the subject land comprised in Survey No.375/1 were taken possession before two witnesses on 19.03.2003. Those who were not received the compensation in respect of the other land owners, it had been duly deposited under the Revenue Deposit by the order dated 18.08.2008. The subject land



including other lands were allotted to the fifth respondent in W.P.No.6600 of 2011 and accordingly they started construction.

13. The petitioner is being a subsequent purchaser by the sale deed, dated 14.12.2005 cannot challenge the Award, dated 05.10.2001 in respect of the property comprised in Survey No.375/1, Old Survey No.375 to an extent of 1.56 acres. Pending the writ petition, this Court raised queries that, whether the proposal, dated 19.06.2000 sent by the SIPCOT has been accepted or rejected.

14. As stated supra, the proposal for deletion of certain lands were duly returned by the communication, dated 26.11.2001 and 12.12.2001. Thereafter, the possession of the subject property has been duly taken on 19.03.2003 and thereafter by an order dated 18.08.2008 including the subject property to an extent of 2.48 acres was duly allotted in favour of the fifth respondent in W.P.No.6600 of 2011.

15. Insofar as the compensation is concerned, the predecessors in title over the subject property were duly received the compensation as per the Award, dated 05.10.2001. Admittedly, the petitioner is a subsequent purchaser and she has no locus to challenge the Award, dated 05.10.2001 passed in the name of the petitioner's vendors' predecessors.



16. In this regard, it is relevant to rely upon the judgment reported

in (2019) 10 SCC 229 in the case of **Shiv Kumar and anr Vs Union of India and ors**, in which the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held as follows

:-

“13. The definition of 'landowner' is in Section 3(r), the same is extracted hereunder:

3. Definition.-In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires,--

(r) "landowner" includes any person,-- (i) whose name is recorded as the owner of the land or building or part thereof, in the records of the authority concerned; or

(ii) any person who is granted forest rights under the Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006 (2 of 2007) or under any other law for the time being in force; or

(iii) who is entitled to be granted Patta rights on the land under any law of the State including assigned lands; or (iv) any person who has been declared as such by an order of the court or Authority;

Landowner is a person who is recorded as the owner of land or building. The record of date of issuance of preliminary notification Under

Section 11 is relevant. A purchaser after Section



11 cannot be said to be a landowner within the purview of Section 3(r).

.....

21. Thus, under the provisions of Section 24 of the Act of 2013, challenge to acquisition proceeding of the taking over of possession under the Act of 1894 cannot be made, based on a void transaction nor declaration can be sought Under Section 24(2) by such incumbents to obtain the land. The declaration that acquisition has lapsed under the Act of 2013 is to get the property back whereas, the transaction once void, is always a void transaction, as no title can be acquired in the land as such no such declaration can be sought. It would not be legal, just and equitable to give the land back to purchaser as land was not capable of being sold which was in process of acquisition under the Act of 1894. The Act of 2013 does not confer any right on purchaser whose sale is ab initio void. Such void transactions are not validated under the Act of 2013. No rights are conferred by the provisions contained in the 2013 Act on such a purchaser as against the State.

22. 'Void is, ab initio,' a nullity, is inoperative, and a person cannot claim the land



or declaration once no title has been conferred upon him to claim that the land should be given back to him. A person cannot enforce and ripe fruits based on a void transaction to start claiming title and possession of the land by seeking a declaration Under Section 24 of the Act of 2013; it will amount to conferment of benefit never contemplated by the law. The question is, who can claim declaration/rights Under Section 24(2) for the restoration of land or lapse of acquisition. It cannot be by a person with no title in the land. The provision of the Act of 2013 cannot be said to be enabling or authorizing a purchaser after Section 4 to question proceeding taken under the Act of 1894 of taking possession as held in U.P. Jal Nigam (supra) which is followed in M. Venkatesh (supra) and other decisions and consequently claim declaration Under Section 24 of the Act of 2013. What cannot be done directly cannot be permitted in an indirect method.

23. The provisions of the Act of 2013 aimed at the acquisition of land with least disturbance to the landowners and other affected families and to provide just and fair compensation to affected families whose land has been acquired or proposed to be acquired or



WEB COPY

Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011

are affected and to make adequate provisions for such affected persons for their rehabilitation and resettlement. The provisions of Act of 2013 aim at ousting all inter-meddlers from the fray by ensuring payment in the bank account of landholders Under Section 77 of the Act.

24. The intendment of Act of 2013 is to benefit farmers etc. Subsequent purchasers cannot be said to be landowners entitled to restoration of land and cannot be termed to be affected persons within the provisions of Act of 2013. It is not open to them to claim that the proceedings have lapsed Under Section 24(2)."

17. In the above judgment, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held that challenging the acquisition proceedings under the provision of Section 24 of the New Act cannot be made, based on a void transaction nor declaration to get the property back. The transaction once void, is always a void transaction, as no title can be acquired in the land as such, no such declaration can be sought. It would not be legal, just and equitable to give the land back to the purchaser as land was not capable of being sold which was in process of acquisition under the Act of 1894. Therefore, the New Act does not confer any right on purchaser whose sale is *ab initio void*.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.nic.in/hcservices/> Therefore the petitioner cannot challenge the acquisition proceedings being



the subsequent purchaser.

WEB COPY 18. In respect of the grounds raised by the petitioner, that the possession of the property and the payment of compensation are concerned, already the Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India settled the issues in the judgment reported in **(2020) 8 SCC 129** in the case of **Indore Development Authority Vs. Manoharlal and ors etc.**, and held as follows:

“366. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we answer the questions as under:

1. Under the provisions of Section 24(1)(a) in case the award is not made as on 1.1.2014 the date of commencement of Act of 2013, there is no lapse of proceedings. Compensation has to be determined under the provisions of Act of 2013.

2. In case the award has been passed within the window period of five years excluding the period covered by an interim order of the court, then proceedings shall continue as provided under Section 24(1)(b) of the Act of 2013 under the Act of 1894 as if it has not been repealed.

3. The word or used in Section 24(2) between possession and compensation has to be read as nor or as and. The deemed lapse of land acquisition proceedings under Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013

takes place where due to inaction of authorities for



WEB COPY

Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011

five years or more prior to commencement of the said Act, the possession of land has not been taken nor compensation has been paid. In other words, in case possession has been taken, compensation has not been paid then there is no lapse. Similarly, if compensation has been paid, possession has not been taken then there is no lapse.

4. The expression 'paid' in the main part of Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 does not include a deposit of compensation in court. The consequence of non-deposit is provided in proviso to Section 24(2) in case it has not been deposited with respect to majority of land holdings then all beneficiaries (landowners) as on the date of notification for land acquisition under Section 4 of the Act of 1894 shall be entitled to compensation in accordance with the provisions of the Act of 2013. In case the obligation under Section 31 of the Land Acquisition Act of 1894 has not been fulfilled, interest under Section 34 of the said Act can be granted. Non-deposit of compensation (in court) does not result in the lapse of land acquisition proceedings. In case of non-deposit with respect to the majority of holdings for five years or more, compensation under the Act of 2013 has to be paid to the "landowners" as on the date of notification for land acquisition under Section 4 of the Act of 1894.



5. *In case a person has been tendered the compensation as provided under Section 31(1) of the Act of 1894, it is not open to him to claim that acquisition has lapsed under Section 24(2) due to non-payment or non-deposit of compensation in court. The obligation to pay is complete by tendering the amount under Section 31(1). Land owners who had refused to accept compensation or who sought reference for higher compensation, cannot claim that the acquisition proceedings had lapsed under Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013.*

6. *The proviso to Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 is to be treated as part of Section 24(2) not part of Section 24(1)(b).*

7. *The mode of taking possession under the Act of 1894 and as contemplated under Section 24(2) is by drawing of inquest report/ memorandum. Once award has been passed on taking possession under Section 16 of the Act of 1894, the land vests in State there is no divesting provided under Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013, as once possession has been taken there is no lapse under Section 24(2).*

8. *The provisions of Section 24(2) providing for a deemed lapse of proceedings are applicable in case authorities have failed due to their inaction to take possession and pay compensation for five years or more before the Act of 2013 came into force, in a*



Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011

proceeding for land acquisition pending with concerned authority as on 1.1.2014. The period of subsistence of interim orders passed by court has to be excluded in the computation of five years.

9. Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 does not give rise to new cause of action to question the legality of concluded proceedings of land acquisition. Section 24 applies to a proceeding pending on the date of enforcement of the Act of 2013, i.e., 1.1.2014. It does not revive stale and time-barred claims and does not reopen concluded proceedings nor allow landowners to question the legality of mode of taking possession to reopen proceedings or mode of deposit of compensation in the treasury instead of court to invalidate acquisition.”

19. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India settled all proposition of law in the above judgment including the grounds raised by the petitioner. That apart, the award has been passed in Award No.02 of 2001 on 05.10.2001 itself and the possession of the property has already been taken by the second respondent in W.P.No.6600 of 2011 and handed over to the fifth respondent W.P.No.6600 of 2011 on 19.03.2003 itself. Therefore, the petitioner failed to satisfy the twin requirements under Section 24 (2) of the New Act i.e., the physical possession of the land was not taken and the



Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011

compensation has not been paid/tendered/deposited in accordance with law.

In view of the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, the issues raised by the petitioner were settled and therefore, the acquisition proceedings have not been lapsed by operation of law under Section 24 (2) of the New Act i.e., Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

20. In view of the above, the writ petition in W.P.No.6600 of 2011 is devoid of merits and it is liable to be dismissed. Accordingly, the writ petition in W.P.No.6600 of 2011 stands dismissed.

21. In view of the dismissal of the writ petition in W.P.No 6600 of 2011, the petitioner is not entitled for Patta and the writ petition in W.P.No.28709 of 2007 is also dismissed.

22. In view of the dismissal of both the writ petitions, no contempt is made out as against the respondents. Therefore, the contempt petition in Cont.P.No2442 of 2016 is dismissed. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous petitions are closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

SD/-

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR(COMM.CASES)

mn

//Certified to be true copy//

Dated at Madras this the day of 2022.



Cont.P.No.2442 of 2016, W.P.Nos. 28709 of 2007 and 6600 of 2011

COURT OFFICER(O.S.)

from 25th day of September 2008 the Registry is issuing Certified copies of the Orders/Judgments/Decrees in this format.

GS/10/06/2022

To

1. The Secretary to Government,
Industries Department,
St.George Fort,
Chennai - 600 009.
2. The Tashildar,
Land Acquisition (Oragadam Project),
SIPCOT Industrial Park,
Irunkattu Kottai,
Sri Perumpudur – 602105.
3. The Special Thasildar (L.A),
SIPCOT,
TACID Division,
Oragadam Scheme,
Irunkattu Kottai,
Sriperumpudur.
4. The District Revenue Officer (L.A),
SIPCOT (TACID Division),
Tambaram,
Chennai - 600 045.
5. The Special Commissioner,
Land Administration (Oragadam Project),
(SIPCOT Industrial Park),
Industries Department,
Chepauk (Ezhilagam),
Chennai - 600 005.

Copy to:

The Section Officer,
Writ Section,
High Court, Madras 104

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>