



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15.02.2024

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR.SANJAY V.GANGAPURWALA, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY

W.A.Nos.671, 673, 840, 849, 850, 845, 847, 848,
852, 853, 854, 856, 857, 843, 844, 851, & 834 of 2020,
58, 69, 85, 102, 106, 90, 92, 98, 86, 93, 97, 99, 94, 105, 100,
111, 114, 113, 116, 120, 118, 123, 127, 121, 124, 135, 137, 129,
138, 126, 130, 134, 136, 140, 142, 150, 152, 156, 146, 148, 149,
151, 172, 176, 179, 174, 175, 272, 345, 284, 292, 310, 287, 275,
345, 293, 294, 288, 297, 264, 265, 296, 359, 455, 685, 918, 986,
988, 989, 1189, 1209, 1328, 1334, 1351, 1354, 1367,
1330, 1345, 1377, 1379 & 1381 of 2021,
367, 374, 377, 376, 373, 512, 520, 525, 990, 997, 544, 551, 555,
582, 675, 688, 709, 711, 1091, 1109, 1112, 1115, 1117, 1129,
1130, 1104, 1105, 1298, 1605, 1606, 1704, 1910, 1956, 1954,
686, 694, 705, 706, 797, 802, 877, 879, 882,
291, 297, 341, 342 & 1431 of 2022
1261 and 1306 of 2023
&
W.P.Nos.31399 of 2018, 13343, 14390, 14412, 14413 of 2020,
23275 of 2022 and 24968, 24976, 34526, 35623 & 32057 of 2023
&
W.P.(MD) Nos.24463 & 24464 of 2018, 19607, 19613, 19614,
19617, 19610, 19609, 19620, 20203, 20204, 20205, 20206,
20698, 20702, 20706, 20709, 20710, 20712, 20713, 20714,
20719, 20727, 20728, 20730, 20968, 20972, 20973, 20970,
21812, 21819, 21816, 21815, 22220, 22227, 23050, 23051,
23178, 23599, 24776, 25094, 19619, 22237, 20966, 22241 &
22247 of 2019, 335, 393,
395, 397, 2175, 3709, 4307, 4686, 7820, 7951, 8638, 9232,



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

12426, 12431, 13728, 14533, 14539, 14535, 1149, 9868, 10104,
10105, 10112, 10124 & 10132 of 2020, 8559, 11232, 356, 8664,
16350, 10587, 10591 & 10590 of 2021
and 15339 & 15340 of 2022

[W.A.No.671 of 2020]

M/s.Sakthi Mining Company
Rep. by its Proprietor, R.Palanaisamy
No.202, Sengodampalayam
O. Rajapalayam Post, Tiruchengode Taluk
Namakkal District.

.. Appellant

Vs.

1. The Secretary to Government
Industries Department
Government of Tamil Nadu
Secretariat, Fort St. George
Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Geology & Mining
Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.
3. The District Collector
Namakkal, Namakkal District.
4. The Assistant Director of Geology & Mining
Geology & Mining Department
Namakkal, Namakkal District.

.. Respondents

Prayer in W.A.No.671 of 2020: Appeal filed under Clause 15 of the
Letters Patent against the order dated 12.06.2020 made in
W.P.No.30484 of 2019.



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

For the Appellant(s) / : Mr.S.Senthil
Petitioner(s) in
W.A.Nos.671 & 673 of
2020 and
W.P.(MD) Nos.20203,
20204, 20205, 20206,
22227, 20979, 20995,
25094 & 22220 of 2019

For the Appellant(s) / : Mr.Sathish Parasaran
Petitioner(s) in Senior Counsel
W.A.No.834 of 2020 & for Mr.T.Poornam &
W.P.No.32057 of 2023 Mr.V.S.Rishwanth

For the Appellant(s) / : Mr.G.Masilamani
Petitioner(s) in Senior Counsel
W.A.Nos.840, 851, 848, for Mr.V.Sanjeevi,
857, 854, 853, 845, 849, Mr.K.Muthukumaran
856, 852, 850, 843, 844 & & Mr.K.Muthukumarasamy
847 of 2020,
126, 130, 140, 134, 136,
156, 367, 373, 377, 374,
376, 512, 997, 525, 520,
990, 551, 582, 555 & 675
of 2022,
341, 342, 1091, 1115,
1109, 1112, 1117, 1129
& 1130 of 2022
& W.P.(MD) Nos.22247,
23050, 23051, 22237,
22231, 20966, 20968,
20970, 20972, 22241 &
20973 of 2019,
9868, 10104, 10105,
10112, 10223, 10124,
10132, 356, 12426 &
12431 of 2020,
16350, 10587, 10590,
10591, 11232, 15339,



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

15340 & 23050 of 2022
and 16350 of 2021

For the Appellant(s) in : Mr.M.Muthappan
W.A.Nos.69 & 359 of 2021

For the Appellant(s) / : Mr.Satish Parasaran
Petitioner(s) in Senior Counsel
W.A.Nos.85, 92, 90, 98, for Mr.K.Ramakrishna Reddy
102, 106, 86, 93, 97,
9994, 105, 100, 111, 114,
113, 116, 127, 120, 123,
118, 121, 129, 138, 135,
137, 124, 142, 150, 152,
297, 989, 156, 146, 149,
148, 151, 172, 179, 174,
175, 176, 272, 292, 345,
284, 310, 287, 275, 293,
288, 294, 264, 296, 265,
986, 988, 1189, 1209,
1377, 1379, 1381 of
2021, 1104, 1105 & 1298
of 2022,
W.P.(MD)Nos.24463 &
24464 of 2018 and 2175,
14533, 14535 &
14539 of 2020

For the Appellants/Petitioners in the : Mr.V.P.Sengottuvel
W.A.Nos.1328, 1345, Senior Counsel
1367, 1351, 1330, 1334 & for Mr.A.Akshay Kumar
1354 of 2021,
W.P.No.13343 of 2020,
W.P.(MD) No.24776 of
2019

For the Appellant(s) / : Mr.A.Rahul
Petitioner(s) in for Mr.K.R.Krishnan
W.A.Nos.58 & 455 of 2021
and W.P.Nos.14412



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

& 14413 of 2020

WEB COPY

For the Appellant(s) in : Mr.P.R.Raman
W.A.No.688, 711 & 709 of Senior Counsel
2022 for Mr.Ashwin Prem Sundar

For the Appellant(s) in : Mr.S.Ambigabathi
W.A.No.918 of 2021

For the Appellant(s) in : Mr.V.Elangovan
W.A.Nos.1605, 1606
& 1704 of 2022

For the Appellant(s) in : Mr.R.Vinoth Kumar
W.A.Nos.291 &
297 of 2022

For the Appellant(s) in : Ms.Selvi George
W.A.Nos.544, 1910, 1956
& 1954 of 2022

For the Appellant(s) in : Mr.T.Ramesh
W.A.No.1261 of 2023

For the Appellant(s) in : Mr.V.Ramamurthy
W.A.No.1306 of 2023

For the Appellant(s) / : Mr.Parthasarathy
Petitioner(s) in Senior Counsel
W.A.No.685 of 2021 and for Mr.Rahul Balaji
W.P.No.31399 of 2018

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.K.Balakrishnan
W.P.No.14390 of 2020

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.Sathish Parasaran
W.P.No.32057 of 2023 Senior Counsel
for Mr.M.T.Poornam

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.J.Anandkumar
W.P.(MD)Nos.19607,
19613, 19619, 19620,
19614, 19617, 19609
& 19610 of 2019



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.Sricharan Rangarajan
W.P.(MD) Nos.20698, Senior Counsel
20702, 20706, 20709, for Mr.C.Jeganathan &
20710, 20712, 20713, Mr.Ramsundar Vijay
20727, 20728, 20730, for M/s.Veera Associates
20719, 20714 of 2019 and
7820 & 9232 of 2020

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.C.Jegannathan
W.P.(MD)Nos.21812,
21819, 21816, 21815 &
23178 of 2019

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.Kingston Jerold
W.P.(MD)No.23599 of
2019

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.Thirunavukkarasu
W.P.(MD)No.335 of 2020

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.G.Mahadevan
W.P.(MD)Nos.393, 395,
397 & 4686 of 2020

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.K.Muthuganesa Pandian
W.P.(MD)No.3709 of 2020

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.R.J.Karthick
W.P.(MD) No.4307 of
2020

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.M.Kannan
W.P.(MD)No.7951 of 2020

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.P.Subburaj
W.P.(MD)No.8638 of 2020

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.A.Anbalakan
W.P.(MD) No.13728 of
2020

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.K.Saravanan



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

W.P.(MD)Nos.8559 &
8664 of 2021

For the Petitioner(s) in : Mr.V.Veerapandian
W.P.(MD)No.1149 of 2020 for M/s.Vast Law Associates

For the Appellant(s) in : Mr.Srinath Sridevan
W.A.Nos.686, 694, 705, Senior Counsel
706, 797, 802, 877, 879 & for Mr.G.Vasudevan
882 of 2022

For the Appellant(s) in : Mr.K.Harishankar
W.A.Nos.1431 &
1438 of 2022

For the Respondent(s) in : Mr.P.S.Raman
all W.As and W.Ps Senior Counsel
assisted by Mr.B.Vijay
Additional Government Pleader
for the State

Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan
Additional Solicitor General
assisted by Mr.V.Chandrasekaran
Senior Panel Counsel for SEIAA

For the Respondent(s) in : Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan
W.A.No.834 of 2020 Additional Solicitor General
assisted by Mr.K.Srinivasamurthy
SPCGC for R3

For the Respondent(s) in : Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan
W.P.(MD) Nos.19607, Additional Solicitor General
19609 & 19610 of 2019, assisted by Mr.K.Srinivasamurthy
4686 of 2020 and SPCGC for R2
W.A.No.834 of 2020

For the Respondent(s) in : Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan
W.A.Nos.686, 797, 877, Additional Solicitor General
879 & 882 of 2022 assisted by Mr.T.L.Thirumalaisamy
CGC for R1

For the Respondent(s) in : Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

W.P.No.31399 of 2018

Additional Solicitor General
assisted by Mr.Venkatasamy
Babu
CGC for R1

For the Respondent(s) in
W.P.No.32057 of 2023

: Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan
Additional Solicitor General
assisted by Mr.A.Kumaraguru
SCGC for R3

COMMON JUDGMENT
(Delivered by the Hon'ble Chief Justice)

The present appeals are directed against the common judgment and order passed by the learned Single Judge, thereby, dismissing the writ petitions filed by the petitioners/present appellants.

2. The petitioners instituted writ petitions, challenging the memos/orders issued by the District Collector, directing the petitioners to pay 100% cost of the mineral lifted for the period from 15.01.2016 to 10.01.2017 towards the cost of mineral. The penalty/cost was premised at 100% of the price of the mineral lifted on the ground that the petitioners operated mines without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance [in short, "EC"] from the Ministry of



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

Environment and Forest, Government of India.
WEB COPY

3. The learned Single Judge at Madurai Bench of Madras High Court had decided to allow the writ petitions on the ground that the principles of natural justice are not followed, however, as the learned Single Judge at the Principal Seat had taken a different view, had referred the matters. All these appeals are filed against the common judgment delivered by the learned Single Judge at the Principal Seat. They are based on similar set of facts and involve common question of law, hitherto, are decided by the common judgment.

4. The learned Single Judge at the Principal Seat concluded that the petitioners continued with the mining operations from 15.01.2016 to 10.01.2017 without obtaining EC. The authority was justified in imposing penalty and/or recovering the 100% cost of the mineral lifted during the said period. The learned Single Judge came to the conclusion that the principles of natural justice cannot be



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

extended for complying with the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

5. The learned Single Judge referred to the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **Common Cause vs. Union of India & Ors.**¹ and observed that the Apex Court held that if mining activities are continued without obtaining EC, then 100% compensation is leviable. The law declared by the Apex Court is binding on all the courts of the Country.

6. The learned Single Judge also held that issuing a show-cause notice will only be an empty formality. EC cannot be granted, if applied, as the appellants/petitioners failed to submit the mining plans. The appellants/petitioners cannot complain about non-issuance of prior notice. The authorities would naturally follow the mandate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Deepak Kumar & Ors. vs. State of Haryana & Ors.**² and the **Common Cause** case (*supra*).

1 (2017) 9 SCC 499

2 CDJ 2012 SC 175



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

7. We have heard the respective learned Senior Advocates/learned advocates appearing for the respective appellants/petitioners, Mr.P.S.Raman, learned Senior Advocate/Special Advocate, as he then was appearing for the respondent State and Mr.AR.L.Sundaresan, learned Additional Solicitor General of India, appearing for the State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority and the Union of India.

8. Learned Senior Advocates/learned advocates for the respective parties were directed to first make their submissions on whether the principles of natural justice are required to be applied and the show-cause notice was required to be issued.

9.1. It is submitted by learned Senior Advocates/learned advocates appearing for the appellants/petitioners that Section 21(5) of the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 [hereinafter referred as "the Act of 1957"], no doubt, does not expressly provide for a show-cause notice/prior hearing, nor are



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

there any Rules framed for this purpose, but the said Section does not exclude, expressly or impliedly, the applicability of the principles of natural justice in the form of prior hearings. This contention is supported by placing reliance on the judgments of the Apex Court in the cases of **CB Gautam vs. Union of India & Ors.**³ and **Manohar vs. State of Maharashtra**⁴.

9.2. It is further submitted by the appellants/petitioners that the levy of penalty/cost, especially at a hefty rate of 100%, without issuance of a prior show-cause notice, in the absence of a specific law enabling the penalty, is alien to the Indian legal jurisprudence. It is stated that without prejudice to the objections to the applicability of Section 21 of the Act of 1957, Section 21 does not mandate imposition of penalty without a prior show-cause notice.

9.3. It is also a settled position of law that even where the law is silent on affording opportunity of hearing, the courts are obliged to read the requirements of observing the principles of natural justice

3 (1993) 1 SCC 78

4 (2012) 13 SCC 14



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

into statutory provisions. A breach of the principles natural justice is enough to interfere with the orders of the authority and *de facto* prejudice is not required to be shown. To buttress the above aspect, reliance is placed on the decisions of the Apex Court in the cases of ***Swami Devi Dayal Hospital & Dental College vs. Union of India***⁵ and ***Dharmpal Satyapal Anand Vs. CCE***⁶.

9.4. It is further contended by the appellants/petitioners that Rule 42(iv) of the Tamil Nadu Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 1959 [for brevity, "the Rules of 1959"], which provides for cancellation of mining lease in the event of failure to submit EC, mandates not only an opportunity of hearing, but a personal hearing ought to have been afforded.

9.5. It is further submitted that under the Acts and Rules, they are not at all liable to pay the penalty and there was no necessity of obtaining EC.

5 (2014) 13 SCC 506

6 (2015) 8 SCC 519



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

10.1. *Per contra*, it is the stand of the respondent State that the demand made by the District Collector, towards recovery cost of minerals was based on the judgment of the Apex Court dated 02.08.2017 in the case of **Common Cause** (*supra*) and the instructions issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India in their office Memorandum dated 03.04.2017 and 30.05.2018, while so, the reply of the appellants/petitioners would not change any facts and outcome of the decision and since the judgment of the Apex Court in **Common Cause** case (*supra*) has not been challenged, the question of issuance of show-cause notice and providing an opportunity of hearing would not be required for recovering the cost of mineral *qua* the quantum of minerals mined and transported without obtaining EC.

10.2. For the said stand, the respondent State relied upon paragraphs 220, 221, 223 and 224 of the impugned judgment and the catena of judgments referred therein.

11. Upon hearing the respective learned Senior Advocates/learned advocates for the respective parties, the initial



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

point of determination would be whether adherence to the principles of natural justice, inasmuch as issuance of show-cause notice prior to the impugned memos/orders, was necessary.

12. The appellants/petitioners have been issued with the licenses to carry on mining operations before the year 2012, i.e., before the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **Deepak Kumar** (*supra*). In the said case, the Apex Court, for the first time, affirmed that the mining lease holders shall obtain EC. Pursuant to the said judgment, amendment came to be incorporated in Rule 42 of the Rules of 1959, wherein, the lessees like the appellants/petitioners were directed to submit EC from the State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority or from the Ministry of Environment and Forest, as the case may be.

13. The said amendment in Rule 42 of the Rules of 1959 was introduced on 22.04.2015 and the existing lease holders were permitted 180 days to submit EC. This period was subsequently extended again and the lease holders were permitted to obtain EC within a period of 630 days, i.e., from 22.04.2015 to 10.01.2017. It appears that the appellants/petitioners had submitted applications for



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

EC before the deadline, however, in many of the matters, the orders have not been passed by the concerned authorities within the stipulated period of 630 days, i.e., up to 10.01.2017. On and from 11.01.2017, the District Collector stopped the quarry operations of all the appellants/petitioners and no quarry operations took place on and from 11.01.2017.

14. In the case of **Sahara India (Firm) (1) vs. CIT⁷**, the Apex Court observed as under:

"19. Thus, it is trite that unless a statutory provision either specifically or by necessary implication excludes the application of principles of natural justice, because in that event the court would not ignore the legislative mandate, the requirement of giving reasonable opportunity of being heard before an order is made, is generally read into the provisions of a statute, particularly when the order has adverse civil consequences for the party affected. The principles will hold good irrespective of whether the power conferred on a statutory body or tribunal is administrative or quasi-judicial."

⁷ (2008) 14 SCC 151



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

15. In the case of **Dharampal Satyapal Limited vs. Deputy Commissioner of Central Excise, Gauhati and Ors.**⁸, the Apex Court observed thus:

"24. The principles have a sound jurisprudential basis. Since the function of the judicial and quasi-judicial authorities is to secure justice with fairness, these principles provide a great humanising factor intended to invest law with fairness to secure justice and to prevent miscarriage of justice. The principles are extended even to those who have to take an administrative decision and who are not necessarily discharging judicial or quasi-judicial functions. They are a kind of code of fair administrative procedure. In this context, procedure is not a matter of secondary importance as it is only by procedural fairness shown in the decision-making that a decision becomes acceptable. In its proper sense, thus, natural justice would mean the natural sense of what is right and wrong."

16. The distinction between a quasi judicial act and an administrative one has almost obliterated. The principles of *audi alteram partem* are now considered to be an essential part of an

⁸ (2015) 8 SCC 519



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

administrative decision.

WEB COPY

17. The principles of natural justice are not embodied in the rules. The principles of natural justice are to be employed to prevent miscarriage of justice. The underlying principles of natural justice is to check the arbitrary exercise of power by the State or its functionaries. The fair play in action is the basic concomitant of any administrative or quasi judicial act.

18. Adherence to the principles of natural justice also helps the authorities to arrive at a just decision and precisely, that is the aim of an administrative or a quasi judicial inquiry. If the statute does not provide for an opportunity of showing cause, still the same shall be provided by way of compliance of the minimum requirement of the principles of natural justice, more particularly, when the action involves civil consequences.

19. The statute/Rule mandating compulsory EC was introduced for the first time on 22.04.2015 and the existing lease holders were



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

permitted 180 days to submit ECs. The said period was subsequently extended to 630 days, viz., from 22.04.2015 to 10.01.2017. In almost all cases, the appellants/petitioners have submitted applications for EC before the dead line. In many of the matters, the applications seeking ECs were not taken up for decision. It is not in dispute that none of the appellants/petitioners carried out quarrying operations on and from 11.01.2017. It is not the case that when the appellants/petitioners were granted mining licenses, the Rule required Environmental Clearance. It is during the subsistence of the license for mining/lease, the amendment was introduced on 22.04.2015 in the Rules and they were permitted to obtain EC within 630 days, i.e., upto 10.01.2017. The appellants/petitioners did apply. Majority of the applications were not decided. It is needless to state they were not rejected.

20. The learned Single Judge came to the conclusion that the ECs could not have been granted by the authority, as the appellants/petitioners failed to submit the mining plans along with the applications for EC and as such, providing an opportunity of showing cause would have been an empty formality. The said



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

observation of the learned Single Judge may not be correct.

21. It needs to be considered that the appellants/petitioners have disputed the quantum of the mineral extracted. The penalty imposed is 100% of the cost of the mineral extracted. When the appellants/petitioners have disputed the quantum of the minerals extracted, it was necessary to give them an opportunity to put forth their stand before the authorities of the quantum of mineral extracted.

22. As observed above, the learned Single Judge has held that providing an opportunity of showing cause or heard would be an empty formality. It is not for the authority to dispense with the requirements of the principles of natural justice on the ground that affording an opportunity would not make any difference. It would not be permissible for the authority to jump over compliance with the principles of natural justice. Such a presumption cannot be applied. No doubt, the Court has to consider whether any prejudice is caused to the person against whom action is taken and whether any purpose is served in remanding the cases, however, the reasons given by the



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

learned Single Judge for dispensing with the principles of natural justice would be factually incorrect.

23. The learned Single Judge has referred to a number of writ petitions, wherein, the applications were made and ECs were not obtained. Upon perusal of the list as it appears in the impugned order, it is abundantly clear that in writ petitions bearing W.P.Nos.29518, 30259, 29564, 29563, 29523, 29260, 29521, 33400, 29567, 29515, 28917, 28911, 30184, 28241, 29570, 28918, 28915, 28245, 29495, 28126, 27182, 27183, 32889, 28096, 28099 & 32498 of 2019, the ECs are granted by the authorities. The appeals of those petitioners have been partly allowed by us and are remitted back to the authorities to take a fresh decision and the said orders/memos are directed to be construed as a show cause notices, as the ECs were already granted to them.

24. As stated above, the fact that some of them have been issued with ECs for the period in dispute subsequently renders the factual observation of the learned Single Judge incorrect, as the learned Single Judge has observed that none of them would get EC,



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

because they have not submitted the mining plan. Moreover, the appellants/petitioners have also disputed the quantum of the minerals extracted. The penalty/cost imposed is 100% cost of the mineral extracted. The said facts also will have to be considered by the authority.

25. In many of the matters, the concerned authority has not decided the applications for EC. If the authority has not decided the applications for EC, the appellants/petitioners cannot be faulted with. Of course, if the applications are defective, it is for the appellants/petitioners to rectify the same. The authority ought to have rejected the applications or allowed the applications.

26. In the present case, the penalty/cost has been imposed upon the appellants/petitioners. The consequence of the administrative action is prejudicial to the appellants/petitioners. When the penalty/cost is imposed, non-adherence to the principles of natural justice would be against the tenets of civil jurisprudence.

27. In view of the aforesaid, we are of the view that the appellants/petitioners ought to have been given an opportunity before



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

the decision was taken to impose 100% penalty/cost upon the appellants/petitioners. An opportunity may be given in a limited way, that is, by giving them an opportunity to reply to the show-cause notices, where they can put forth all the relevant facts and their defences, which certainly would have to be considered by the authorities before passing the order.

28. In the result, we pass the following orders:

(i) The impugned order passed by the learned Single Judge at the Principal Seat is quashed and set aside;

(ii) The impugned orders/memos imposing 100% penalty/cost upon the appellants/petitioners shall be construed as show-cause notices;

(iii) The appellants/petitioners shall file reply to the said show-cause notices, along with all the relevant documents on which they rely, within a period of four weeks from today; and

(iv) The authority shall consider the reply filed by the appellants/petitioners individually and pass



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

fresh orders with regard to imposing of penalty/cost or otherwise.

29. As we have remitted the matters back to the concerned authorities on the ground that the principles of natural justice were not adhered to, we have not considered the other contentions raised by the respective learned Senior Advocates/learned advocates appearing for the appellants/petitioners and the respondents. They are kept open.

30. In light of the above, these writ appeals and writ petitions stand partly allowed. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, C.M.P.Nos.9352, 9354, 10647, 10650, 10654, 10655, 10656, 10658, 10659, 10660, 10661, 10662, 10667, 10668, 10670, 10676, 10581, 10583, 10599 & 10601 of 2020, 532, 583, 651, 656, 660, 669, 673, 678, 661, 667, 670, 653, 663, 671, 676, 684, 687, 686, 689, 692, 693, 697, 699, 695, 698, 703, 708, 712, 713, 700, 704, 707, 711, 717, 726, 737, 738, 743, 732, 733, 734, 736, 822, 828, 829, 832, 838.1125, 1163, 1191, 1295, 1380, 1128, 1180, 1181, 1193, 1196, 1094, 1096, 1200, 1203, 1426, 1798, 3823, 10470,



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

5421, 5423, 6127, 6132, 6136, 7580, 7696, 8315, 8316, 8318, 8321, 8323, 8327, 8413, 8414, 8444, 8448, 8459, 8460, 8492, 8494, 8590, 8591 & 8596 of 2021, 3997, 13249, 4806, 4917, 4928, 6834, 6835, 8185, 14048, 14278, 14266, 4799, 4821, 4896, 4902, 5462, 5484, 5868, 5880 & 5920 of 2022, 12600 & 12953 of 2023, W.M.P.Nos.36589, 36585 & 36587 of 2018, 16481 of 2020, 17898, 17900, 22217 & 22218 of 2022, 24395, 24397, 24399, 34439, 35569 & 35571 of 2023 and W.M.P.(MD)Nos.22171 & 22172 of 2018, 16065, 16067, 16069, 16074, 19614, 19617, 16076, 16751, 16753, 16754, 16755, 17326, 17329, 17330, 17334, 17323, 17324, 17347, 17349, 17333, 17335, 17336, 17346, 18549, 18545, 18551, 18555, 18993, 18998, 19789, 19791, 19900, 20225, 20227, 21383, 21692, 21693, 16078, 16079, 17565, 17568, 17572, 17573, 20970, 20792, 20973 & 19024 of 2019, 254, 316, 313, 314, 395, 397, 1834, 3132, 3130, 3623, 4058, 4059, 7295, 7296, 7400, 7983, 7984, 8417, 8418, 10631, 10637, 1243, 11395, 11397, 12191, 12192, 12197, 14535, 909, 8840, 8995, 8990, 9006, 9017, 9018 & 9020 of 2020, 6442, 8775, 278, 6527, 6529, 13196, 13199, 8241, 8243, 8248, 8249, 8251 & 8252 of 2021 and 10979, 10980, 10993 & 10996 of 2022 are closed.



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

(S.V.G., CJ.)

(D.B.C., J.)

15.02.2024

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
drm



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

WEB COPY

To:

1. The Secretary to Government
Industries Department, Government of Tamil Nadu
Secretariat, Fort St. George, Chennai – 600 009.
2. The Commissioner of Geology & Mining
Guindy, Chennai – 600 032.
3. The District Collector
Namakkal, Namakkal District.
4. The Assistant Director of Geology & Mining
Geology & Mining Department,
Namakkal, Namakkal District.



WEB COPY



W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY,J.

(drm)

W.A.No.671 of 2020 & etc. batch

15.02.2024