



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 20.12.2022

Pronounced on : 04.01.2023

CORAM :

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.V.KARTHIKEYAN

W.P.No. 10442 of 2022

And

W.M.P.Nos. 10143 & 10146 of 2022

K.Vasan

... Petitioner

..Vs..

1. The Government of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by its Secretary to Government
Geology and Mining Department
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Deputy Director of Geology and Mining
Kancheepuram.
3. The District Collector
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.
4. V.Murali ... Respondents



PRAYER: Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, praying for the issue of a Writ of Certiorari calling for the records relating to the order of the third respondent herein in Na.Ka.No.53/Q3/2020 dated 08.04.2022 in respect of the rough stone and gravel quarry in S.F.No. 121/1E2, 121/1F, 121/2, 122/2A3, 122/2B1, 193/1A3B and 193/1A3B and 193/1A4 in the land of an extent of 2.01.00 hectares in No. 77, Mampudur Village, Uthiramerur Taluk and quash the same.

For Petitioner :: Mr. AR.Karthick Lakshmanan

For 1st to 3rd Respondents:: Mr. T.Sreenivasan
Special Government Pleader

For 4th Respondent:: Mr. S.Parthasarathy

ORDER

The Writ Petition has been filed in the nature of a Writ of Certiorari seeking records relating to the order of the third respondent / the District Collector, Kancheepuram District, Kancheepuram in Na.Ka.No.53/Q3/2020 dated 08.04.2022 in respect of the rough stone and gravel quarry in S.F.No. 121/1E2, 121/1F, 121/2, 122/2A3, 122/2B1, 193/1A3B and 193/1A3B and 193/1A4 in land measuring 2.01.00 hectares in Mampudur Village, Uthiramerur Taluk and to quash the same.

2. During the pendency of the Writ Petition, the fourth



respondent V.Murali, had been impleaded by an order dated 29.06.2022 in WMP No. 15325 of 2022.

3. In the affidavit filed in support of the Writ Petition, K.Vasan, the owner of the aforesaid lands at Mampudur Village, Uthiramerur Taluk, had stated that the lands contained deposits of minor minerals such as Rough Stone and Gravel which were capable of being quarried in a scientific manner. He applied for no objection from the Tahsildar, Uthiramerur. After inspection of the site and local enquiry, the Tahsildar also granted no objection by proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 1164/2020/A1 dated 13.08.2020. Thereafter, the Personal Assistant (General) to the District Collector, Kancheepuram, by proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 2017/2020/A-1 dated 04.09.2020 also granted no objection for grant of stone quarry license.

4. The petitioner then applied for environmental clearance before the State Level Environmental Impact Assessment Authority, Tamil Nadu. The said authority also granted Environmental Clearance by proceedings in Lr.No. SEIAA-TN/F.No. 8127/EC No. 4515/2020 dated



20.02.2021 for a period of five years. Thereafter, the second respondent, the Deputy Director of Geology and Mining in Kancheepuram, granted license to quarry rough stone and gravel by proceedings No. Na.Ka.No.53/Q3/2020 dated 26.02.2021 for a period of 10 years. The second respondent also executed an agreement for a period of 10 years from 26.02.2021 to 25.02.2031 for quarrying and carrying away of mining minerals from the ryotwari lands wherein the minerals belonged to the Government. The petitioner was also granted transport permit for transportation of the minerals to be excavated from the quarry.

5. It was further stated in the affidavit that suo moto proceedings were then initiated by the National Green Tribunal (South zone) in O.A.No. 170 of 2021 with respect to mineral activities in Kancheepuram District on the basis of a report in Times of India dated 13.07.2021. The National Green Tribunal appointed a Joint Inspection Committee and passed final orders in O.A.No. 170 of 2021 dated 26.10.2021. With respect to the permissions granted to the petitioner, the National Green Tribunal disposed the Original Application with a direction that the authorities shall conduct periodical inspection and



ensure that there is no excessive mining or illegal transportation carried out and Rules and Regulations were duly implemented.

6. It was further stated that the fourth respondent, who had been subsequently impleaded as a party to the Writ Petition had earlier filed W.P.No. 795 of 2022 seeking a direction against the third respondent, District Collector, Kancheepuram District, to consider his representation dated 28.12.2021 and stop the petitioner from forming/erecting crusher or M sand unit in the aforesaid lands on the allegation that the petitioner had encroached the lake and mountain reserve forest. That Writ Petition was disposed of as withdrawn with liberty to the said Writ Petitioner V.Murali to approach the National Green Tribunal. The petitioner claimed that he had not received any further notice from the National Green Tribunal.

7. The petitioner further stated that the third respondent/ District Collector, Kancheepuram District, had issued a notice of enquiry on 04.04.2022 stating that there have been objections received from the public for commencement of the quarry operations by the petitioner. The



petitioner further stated that the third respondent by proceedings in Na.Ka.No. 53/Q3/2020 dated 08.04.2022 directed temporary suspension of the quarry license. Questioning that particular order, the present Writ Petition has been filed.

8. The petitioner claimed that all the authorities had granted necessary no objection certificates including the jurisdictional Tahsildar, the State Level Environmental Impact Assessment Authority and also the third respondent, the Deputy Director of Geology and Mining. He also stated that the National Green Tribunal had also disposed of the Original Application by directing that periodical inspection must be done and it must be ensured that the activities are in accordance with the necessary Rules and Regulations. It was also pointed out that the Writ Petition filed by the fourth respondent had been withdrawn.

9. It was thus stated that, therefore, the third respondent had no lawful authority to direct temporary suspension of the quarry license already granted to the petitioner.

10. During the earlier hearings of the Writ Petition, several



interim orders had been passed. A learned Single Judge of this Court had granted an interim stay of the order on 10.06.2022. Though it was for a limited period and had been extended intermittently it can be safely understood to be in force till this date.

11. By an order dated 23.09.2022, my predecessor had directed as follows:-

“The Secretary, Geology and Mining shall file an affidavit disclosing the following :

(a) The process by which the lands are identified as potential quarries?

(b) What is the criteria adopted by the Government while identifying such quarries?

(c) What are the safeguards that are put in place in the process of identification of quarries?

(d) In case of patta lands, what are the restrictions that are imposed on the quarrying, apart from granting licences?

(e) Who is the Officer responsible for



identifying a potential quarry and putting it to auction?

(f) Who is the Officer responsible for grant of licences for quarrying any private lands?

(g) Under what circumstances can the authorities cancel the quarrying license except violations or non-compliance with the statutory requirements?

(h) What will be the action that would be taken against the Officers who are responsible for identifying unsuitable lands as quarries?

Post on 10.10.2022. ”

12. On 17.10.2022, my learned predecessor had also passed the following order:-

“ That there shall be a direction to the official respondents to form a team of inspection consisting of a person from Revenue Department not below the rank of Revenue Divisional Officer, a person from Geology and Mining Department not below the rank of Joint Director of Mining and



also a person from Forest Department/Social Forestry not below the rank of Deputy Conservator of Forest to inspect the quarry site and the locality along with the petitioner and his counsel with two representatives and their counsel from the village concerned.

The entire inspection shall be observed by an Advocate Commissioner to be appointed by this Court. For that purpose, Mr.C.K.Chandrasekaran, Advocate, No.279, Additional Law Chamber, 1st Floor, Madras High Court, Chennai - 104 [Mobile No.94441 84899] is appointed as Advocate Commissioner, who shall after monitoring or observing this entire episode of inspection, for which, advance intimation shall be given by the official respondents to the Advocate Commissioner, file a report.

Therefore, there shall be two reports, one by the team of officials, who inspected the spot as indicated above and another by



the Advocate Commissioner. The two reports shall be filed during the next hearing date, for which, four weeks period is granted. ”

13. Thereafter, the following order was passed on 14.11.2022:-

“Pursuant to the order dated 17.10.2022, the quarry site was inspected on 05.11.2022 from morning to afternoon, the Advocate Commissioner, who monitored and supervised the inspection as directed by this Court, having done so, has filed a detailed report along with bunch of photographs, the original FMB sketch A register etc., issued by the Revenue Department have also been annexed along with the report.

2. The copy of the said report of the Advocate Commissioner has already been served on all parties.

3. Insofar as the report to be filed by the official respondents is concerned, Mr.B.Vijay,



learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the official respondents, on instructions would submit that though inspection was conducted, before preparation of the report, the Joint Director of Mining, who was the Head of the inspection team, who is supposed to prepare the report and file it, since affected by the cardiac arrest and he had to undergo some surgery and as of now, he is in hospital, therefore, in whose place one Deputy Director, who is in-charge of this area as Joint Director has been deputed by the Department. Therefore, who has to take in-charge of this job and file a report, for which, he seeks one week time.

4.

5. In case, the parties want to file any objection to the Advocate Commissioner report, they can do so. Insofar as the report to be submitted by the official team is concerned, after filing the report, that can also be gone through, where also if they want to file any objections, they can do so.



WEB COPY

6. Within the aforesaid one week time, the report can be served to either side by the official respondents through the learned Additional Government Pleader and on receipt of the same, the needful as indicated above can be done by the parties within one week thereafter. ”

14. The third respondent/ District Collector, Kancheepuram, Dr.M.Aarthi, had filed a counter affidavit wherein it was stated that the quarry license was suspended on the basis of a report submitted by the jurisdictional Revenue Divisional Officer and mining Officials. It had been stated that the order was only a temporary measure and the Writ Petition had been filed even before the conclusion of final proceedings. It was therefore stated that the Writ Petition is premature and was not maintainable.

15. It was also stated that there was an alternate remedy by filing an Appeal under Rule 36 of the Tamil Nadu Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 1959, as amended. It had been further stated that several



objections had been received from the local public against the grant of quarry lease to the petitioner and they had been forwarded to the Revenue Divisional Officer, Kancheepuram, for taking necessary action. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Kancheepuram, by letter dated 11.03.2022 in Letter R.C.No. 613/2022/A1 complained that the agriculture and livestock in Mampudur Village will be affected due to the drainage from the stone quarry. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Kancheepuram, had requested cancellation of the quarry lease granted to the petitioner.

16. In order to take a considered decision, on the quarry lease granted to the petitioner, a personal hearing was offered to the petitioner and he was instructed to appear before the third respondent on 04.04.2022. The petitioner appeared and submitted a written statement.

17. The Deputy Director, Department of Geology and Mining, Kancheepuram, the second respondent and the Assistant Geologist of the Department of Geology and Mining, Kancheepuram, inspected the area on 05.04.2022 and reported that one vaikkal is passing in the lease granted area and if quarry activities were continued, the vaikkal will be affected and the water will not pass to the nearby agricultural fields.



WEB COPY

18. It was further stated that the local public also complained that the road available in meikkal poramboke in S.F.No. 186 will be damaged due to the vehicle transportation from the quarry. They sought to cancel the quarry lease granted to the petitioner.

19. Based on these complaints, the second respondent had recommended suspension of the quarry lease as a temporary measure.

20. The impugned order has been passed on 08.04.2022 temporarily suspending the quarry portions.

21. It had been further stated by the third respondent that after the petitioner had received no objections from the various authorities, the local public had given several petitions and therefore, a decision was taken to temporarily suspend the quarry lease granted to the petitioner, till a final decision was taken after affording opportunity of personal hearing. It was stated that clause 9 of the quarry lease deed grants the authority to cancel the quarry lease if there are objections from the general public. It was therefore urged by the third respondent that the Writ Petition should be dismissed.



WEB COPY

22. As stated, it had been directed by my predecessor that inspections should be conducted by the Advocate Commissioner, who had been appointed by the Court and a Joint Inspection by the District Forest Officer, Regional Joint Director and the Revenue Divisional Officer.

23. The Advocate Commissioner after inspection, had filed a report. According to his report, the lands of the petitioner are situated at a distance of about 300 meters from the reserve forest. It was stated that the Mampudur Lake is situated at a distance of more than 120 meters and that the lake bund is more than 8 meters in height. It was stated that the lands were not in the pathway of the flow from the lake. It was also stated that there was no inhabitation in the area. It was further stated that the floor surface has rocks which according to the Assistant Director of Mines, Mining Department, could have been formed about two million years ago. It was stated that soft rock is visible at 4 feet and hard rock at 6 feet. It was stated that cultivation was not done in the past year. It was also stated that there was encroachment in the poramboke land. It was



stated that 3 kms from the lands, there was cultivation of paddy in several lands. It was also stated that digging of lands in the Meikkal was done by the respondent by using JCB to prevent access through the pathway to the petitioner and that it was done recently. It was also stated that though ploughing was noticed, it was of recent time.

24. It was further stated by the Advocate Commissioner that the FMB sketch and the Village Map did not evidence any water channel or vaaikaal flowing through the petitioner's land. This report was dated 09.11.2022.

25. A joint inspection report was also filed dated 25.11.2022. This was signed by the District Forest Officer, Kancheepuram, the Regional Joint Director, Villupuram / Assistant Director (G&M) (in-charge), Kancheepuram and the Revenue Divisional Officer, Kancheepuram. During the joint inspection report, the Tahsildar, the Sub Inspector of Survey, Deputy Inspector of survey, Zonal Deputy Tahsildar, Revenue Inspector, Firka- Surveyor, Village Administrative Officer, the writ petitioner, the counsel for the petitioner, the fourth respondent and the counsel for the fourth respondent were all present.



WEB COPY

26. The District Forest Officer, Kancheepuram, in his observations stated that the quarry area is surrounded by Eri in the north (120 meter), Thangal in the south, Edamachi Reserve Forest in the West (300 meters) and agricultural field and grazing land on the East (10 meters). It was stated that all the above lands make a complete ecosystem surrounding the proposed quarry site. It was also stated that the grazing land has characteristics of an open forest. It was further stated that Social Forestry Plantation was done in the grazing land in the year 2005 and Naaval and Tamarind trees were planted. These trees in the grazing land take care of the need of villagers and reduce the pressure on the near by reserve forest area. Further, the Edamachi Reserve Forest has wildlife like deer, wild boar, peacock, jackal along with birds and snakes. It was stated that deer, wild boar and peacock were spotted frequently in the proposed site area. It was further stated that quarrying would prove detrimental to the existing ecosystem by disconnecting natural pathways that exists between forest Eri and the grazing land which will lead to human-wildlife conflict. It was also stated that transport would affect productivity and availability of NTFP to the



villagers. It was also stated that according to G.O.Ms.No.295 Industries (MMC.1) Department dated 03.11.2021, no quarrying or mining or crushing activities shall be carried out within one kilometer radial distance from Reserve Forest.

27. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Kancheepuram, in her observation stated that S.No. 186 belongs to Meikkal classification and is used as a pathway to reach the above field and is the only available pathway to access the field. Further, field water channel is situated between S.Nos. 193 and 121 and also in S.No. 121 and 122. It has been mentioned in the Village Map but not in Field Measurement Book.

28. The Joint Director of Geology and Mining, in his observations had stated that the land is flat terrain. With respect to the general topography of the area, he also stated that Mambudur Periya Eri is situated on the north side at a distance of 120 meters. As per rule, a safety distance of 50 meters has to be provided. It was also stated that under G.O.Ms.No. 295 mentioned above, no quarrying activity can be carried out within one kilometer radial distance from Reserve Forest. It



was stated that the Reserve Forest was at a distance of 300 meters. It was also stated that it had been observed a water channel vaikkal was passing from the Eri to the farming and grazing poramboke land via the lease granted area.

29. In the findings, it had been stated that there were two water channels passing through the lease granted area and S.No. 186 belongs to Meikkal classification and is used as pathway to reach the above field. It is the only means of pathway. As per G.O.Ms.No. 295 the Reserve Forest should be at a radial distance of more than one kilometer but it is within 300 meters. Two water channels run through the lease granted area.

30. The fourth respondent had also filed a counter but since the fourth respondent was one among the general public who had raised objections to grant of quarrying, it would be prudent not to place reliance on the same.

31. Heard arguments advanced by Mr. AR. Karthick



Lakshmanan, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Mr.T.Sreenivasan, learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the first to third respondents and Mr.S.Parthasarathy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the fourth respondent.

32. The learned counsel for the petitioner pointed out that the petitioner had obtained license and no objection certificates from the necessary authorities, namely, the Tahsildar, the State Level Environmental Impact Assessment Authority and also from the second respondent. It was therefore urged that the third respondent, could not have and should not have passed the impugned order merely based on objections raised by the public. The learned counsel insisted that the report of the Advocate Commissioner is very clear that the quarrying would not affect any of the activities of the surrounding area or the public. The learned counsel stated that therefore, the Writ Petition should be allowed and the impugned order should be interfered with by this Court.



WEB COPY

33. The learned Special Government Pleader appearing for the first to third respondents however pointed out the Joint Inspection Committee report carried out under the directions of this Court and stated that the report is quite clear that the Reserve Forest and vaikkal and Meikkal pathway are surrounding the land and more over in view of the objections raised by the general public, it had been stated that grant of lease had been rightfully and lawfully interfered with by the third respondent. Even the agreement of lease provided that if there are objections by the public, the District Collector can interfere with the grant of lease or continuation of quarrying activities. The impugned order was therefore justified by the learned Special Government Pleader.

34. Mr. S.Parthasarathy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the fourth respondent pointed out that continuation of quarrying activities would cause loss and hardship to the general public and urged that the lease granted should be cancelled and that the impugned order should be upheld.

35. I have carefully considered the arguments advanced and



perused the relevant records.

36. The petitioner had sought for and obtained permission to quarry rough stone and gravel in S.F.Nos. 121/1E2, 121/1F, 121/2, 122/2A3, 122/2B1, 193/1A3B and 193/1A3B and 193/1A4 in the land measuring 2.01.00 hectares at Mampudur Village, Uthiramerur Taluk. He was the owner of the lands. It is seen that the Tahsildar, Uthiramerur, had granted no objection by an order dated 13.08.2020. Thereafter, the Personal Assistant (General) to the District Collector, Kancheepuram had also granted no objection by an order dated 04.09.2020. Further, the State Level Environmental Impact Assessment Authority had also considered the application of the petitioner and granted Environmental Clearance by proceedings dated 20.02.2021. After considering the above orders, the second respondent, Deputy Director of Geology and Mining had also granted license to quarry rough stone and gravel for a period of 10 years and an agreement in effect from 26.02.2021 to 25.02.2031 had also been entered into with the petitioner. These are facts which cannot be disputed.

37. It is also seen that the National Green Tribunal had disposed



of O.A.No. 170 of 2021 taken suo moto by it by observing that the petitioner should comply with the Rules and Regulations and the terms of license.

38. It is also seen that the fourth respondent, who had filed W.P.No. 795 of 2022 had withdrawn the said Writ Petition.

39. Thereafter, the third respondent had issued a notice calling upon the petitioner to attend an enquiry on 04.04.2022. It was stated that there were objections from the public. The petitioner had given a written statement before the third respondent on 04.04.2022. By the impugned order dated 08.04.2022, the third respondent had directed temporary suspension of the quarry license.

40. It had been stated in the counter affidavit of the third respondent that in view of the objections raised by the general public, the impugned order had been passed. It had been clearly stated that final orders shall necessarily have to be passed after hearing the objections and considering all records. The petitioner had come to Court even without



giving that particular opportunity to the third respondent.

WEB COPY

41. My learned predecessors had directed an Advocate Commissioner to inspect the area and had also directed that a Joint Inspection should be conducted by three officials, namely, the District Forest Officer, Kancheepuram, the Regional Joint Director, Villupuram / Assistant Director, Geology and Mining, Kancheepuram and the Revenue Divisional Officer, Kancheepuram.

42. The Advocate Commissioner, who had been appointed, had gone around the area and had filed a report wherein he had stated that in his observation of the land though there was a lake, namely, Mampudur Lake, it was at a distance of more than 120 meters and there was a lake bund of more than 8 meters. He stated that the lands were not in the pathway of the water flow of the lake. He also stated that the lands are at a distance of about 300 meters from the Reserve Forest. He also stated that there were no inhabitations in the area. He also stated that there was no cultivation in the area. He stated that there were no schools, no burial grounds in the area. He also stated that the lands were away from the



nearby village and there was much open space. In effect, the Advocate Commissioner had given a report favouring the continuation of quarrying by the petitioner since there was no possibility of water way, flora, fauna or public being affected.

43. Even before examining the observations presented in the Joint Inspection Report, it must be stated that the Advocate Commissioner is not an expert over the aspects stated. No Advocate Commissioner or any Advocate for that matter, can speak with depth about the impact on the ecosystem by quarrying which takes place in the pathway of wild life found in the adjacent Reserve Forest. The Advocate Commissioner appears to have walked around the land meant for quarrying and had given his observations as to what he found in the land. The work done by the Advocate Commissioner is deeply appreciated by this Court but I would reject every observation made. Let me however place on record due appreciation for the diligent and sincere effort taken.

44. A Joint Inspection Report had been simultaneously directed



by my predecessors in their wisdom and I would bow to their wisdom in ordering such Joint Inspection by the named Officials.

45. In the Joint Inspection Report, the District Forest Officer had very clearly stated that the quarrying area is surrounded by Eri in the North (120 meters), by Thangal in the South, by Edamachi Reserve Forest in the West (300 meters) and by agricultural field and grazing land on the East (10 meters). The entire component makes a complete ecosystem surrounding the proposed quarry site. The grazing land has characteristics of open forest. Social Forestry plantation was done and Naaval and Tamarind trees were planted in the year 2005. These trees in the grazing land take care of the needs of the villagers and reduce the pressure on the nearby forest area. It was also stated that the Reserve Forest has flora and fauna in abundance. There are deer, wild boar, peacock and jackal. As a matter of fact, deer, wild boar and peacock were also seen frequently in the quarrying area.

46. All these findings clearly show that if quarrying were to be



done by digging and crushing the rocks into stone and transporting the stones, it would destroy the surrounding ecosystem. This area is a pathway not only for humans but also for wild animals. If the pathway is interfered with it would lead to human-wild life conflict. The transportation route will have to pass through the grazing land and would directly affect productivity and the availability of the needs of the local villagers.

47. As a matter of fact, G.O.Ms.No. 295 Industries (MMC.1) Department dated 03.11.2021 prohibits quarrying activities within one kilometer radial distance from a Reserve Forest. The petitioners lands are situated within 300 meters.

48. Further S.No. 186 belongs to meikkal classification and is used as a pathway. It is the only means of pathway to access the fields. There is also a water channel between S.No. 193 and 121 and 122. This has been mentioned in the Village Map though not in the Field Measurement Book.



WEB COPY

49. The public have also raised the objections.

50. It is also seen from the report that top soil, namely, gravel have permeability of water.

51. I hold that the third respondent had acted with much prudence in temporarily suspending the license of the petitioner. Final orders have not been passed.

52. Rule 36-C of the Tamil Nadu Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 1959 as amended deals with Appeals. Rule 36-C (2) is as follows:-

“36-C. Appeal and Second Appeal:-

(2) Any person aggrieved by any order made by the District Collector in exercise of the powers conferred on him by these rules, except on appeals under sub-rule (1) may, within 30 days from the date of communication of the order to him,



appeal to the Director of Geology and Mining against such order. In case, the aggrieved person is not satisfied with the decision of the Director of Geology and Mining, he may prefer a second appeal to the State Government within 30 days from the date of receipt of the order of the Director of Geology and Mining.”

53. G.O.(Ms)No. 295, Industries (MMC-1) Department dated 03.11.2021 had been introduced as an amendment to the Tamil Nadu Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 1959. By the said Government Order, clause (e) had been added to Rule 36 (1-A) as follows:-

“(e) Notwithstanding anything contained in any law for the time being in force, no quarrying or mining or crushing activities shall be carried out within one kilometre radial distance or the protective distance as notified by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India from time to time, whichever is more, from the boundaries of ecologically sensitive



areas, environmentally and ecologically protected areas such as the National Parks, Wild Life Sanctuaries, Tiger Reserves, Elephant Corridors and Reserve Forests.”

54. It is seen that the third respondent had not passed final orders and as against any order passed, the petitioner has an alternate remedy which has not been exhausted.

55. Further by G.O.(Ms).No. 295, by virtue of the amendment, no quarry activity can be carried on within a distance of one kilometer from a Reserve Forest Area. In the instant case the distance is only 300 meters.

56. Viewed from any angle, the relief sought by the Writ Petitioner cannot be granted.

57. The Writ Petition stands dismissed. Cost of Rs.25,000/-



(Rupees Twenty Five Thousands only) to be paid to the District Mineral Foundation Trust, Kancheepuram District, Government of Tamil Nadu. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

04.01.2023

Index :Yes/No
Internet:Yes/No
vsg
To

1. The Secretary to Government
The Government of Tamil Nadu
Geology and Mining Department
Fort St. George,
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Deputy Director of Geology and Mining
Kancheepuram.
3. The District Collector
Kancheepuram District,
Kancheepuram.

C.V.KARTHIKEYAN, J.

vsg



WEB COPY



Pre-Delivery Judgment made in
W.P.No. 10442 of 2022
And
W.M.P.Nos. 10143 & 10146 of 2022

04.01.2023