



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16.03.2022

CORAM:

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

W.P. No.5724 of 2022

and W.M.P.Nos.5808, 5810 and 5811 of 2022

1.Rayappa

2.Jakuline

3.R.Gandhimathi

4.I.Arulanandam

5.Lavarandian

6.Joseph victor

.... Petitioners

Versus

1.The Principal Secretary,
Industrial Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.

2.The District Collector,
Kancheepuram,
Kancheepuram District.

3.The Special Tahsildar (LA),
Unit-I, SIPCOT Oragadam,
Expansion, Scheme-II,
Sriperumbudur Taluk,
Kancheepuram District.

4.The Managing Director,
SIPCOT oragadam,
Expansion Scheme-II,
Sriperumbudur Taluk,
Kancheepuram District.

... Respondents

Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, pleaded to issue Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus, calling for the records of the 3rd respondent's proceedings vide RC.No.12/09/Unit/I, dated 01.03.2010 and quash the same and consequently, direct the 3rd respondent herein to issue no



objection in favour of the petitioner property situated at No.182, Vaippur B Block, Eraiyur village, Kundrathur Taluk, Kancheepuram District.

WEB COPY

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Ramesh

For Respondents : Mr.P.Sathish, AGP for RR1 to 3
Mr.Ramesh Venkatachalapathy (for R4)

ORDER

This Writ Petition is filed by the petitioners, calling for the records of the 3rd respondent's proceedings vide RC.No.12/09/Unit/I, dated 01.03.2010 and quash the same and consequently, direct the 3rd respondent herein to issue no objection in favour of the petitioner property situated at No.182, Vaippur B Block, Eraiyur village, Kundrathur Taluk, Kancheepuram District.

2.The case of the petitioners is that the petitioners are claiming that they are the owners of the properties in question under the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Land for Industrial Purposes Act, 1997 (Tamil Nadu Act 10 of 1999).

3.The Learned Counsel appearing for the fourth respondent would submit that after sending 3(1) notification, which was published in the Government Gazette dated 13.06.2014. Without challenging 3(1) notification, filing a Writ Petition by challenging 3(2) notification is not sustainable in law.

4.Considering the circumstance of the case, and the petitioners filing a writ petition challenging 3(2) notification issued on 01.03.2010, however, subsequently, 3(1) notification was issued on 13.06.2014, without challenging 3(1) notification instead of 3(2) notification is not sustainable in law. Hence, the prayer sought in the Writ Petition is not appropriate. However, the petitioners are at liberty to work out their remedy with an appropriate forum in accordance with law.

5.In view of the same, the Writ Petition is disposed of.
No costs.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS-II)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar



vsi2/klt

TO

- 1.The Principal Secretary,
Industrial Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai-600 009.
- 2.The District Collector,
Kancheepuram,
Kancheepuram District.
- 3.The Special Tahsildar (LA),
Unit-I, SIPCOT Oragadam,
Expansion, Scheme-II,
Sriperumbudur Taluk,
Kancheepuram District.
- 4.The Managing Director,
SIPCOT oragadam,
Expansion Scheme-II,
Sriperumbudur Taluk,
Kancheepuram District.

+lcc to Mr.R.Ramesh, Advocate SR.No.18415
+lcc to Mr.Ramsh Venkatachalapathy, Advocate SR.No.17708
+lcc to the Government Pleader SR.No.18142

W.P. No.2799 of 2022

SPD(CO)
GN(01/04/2022)