



W.P.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.11.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.SUNDAR

and

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

W.P.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

and

W.M.P.Nos.35697, 35702, 35706, 35709 & 35711 of 2024

in

W.P.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

Yellamma

W/o.V.Latchumayya

... Petitioner

in W.P.No.32876 of 2024

P.S.Arumugam

S/o.Samundi Gounder

... Petitioner

in W.P.No.32881 of 2024

V.Ganesh

S/o.K.P.Venkatasubramaniam

... Petitioner

in W.P.No.32885 of 2024

Shoba

W/o.Late Nagaraj

... Petitioner

in W.P.No.32888 of 2024

Selvi

W/o.Raman

... Petitioner

in W.P.No.32890 of 2024

Page Nos.1/26



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

Vs.

The Executive Engineer and
Administrative Officer
Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Bhagalur Road,
Hosur - 635 109.

... Respondent in all WPs

Prayer :

Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of The Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Certiorarified Mandamus to call for the records relating to the impugned orders having reference No.P2/5389/2005 dated 09.08.2024 issued by the respondent and quash the same and consequently, direct the respondent not to take any further action pursuant to the said order.


For Petitioner in all WPs	:	Ms.R.Divya Preathika
For Respondents in all WPs	:	Mr.D.Veerasekharan for Mr.S.Ramachandran Standing Counsel, TNHB

COMMON ORDER

[Order of the Court was made by **M.SUNDAR, J.,**]

In the captioned 'five writ petitions' {hereinafter 'WPs' for the sake of brevity} 'five different notices, all dated 09.08.2024 bearing reference No.P2/5389/2005' {hereinafter 'impugned notices' for the sake of brevity} have been called in question.

Page Nos.2/26

[illegible]



W.P.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

3. Learned counsel submits that W.P.No.19766 of 2017 etc., batch has been filed by the writ petitioners' vendors and others challenging the acquisition proceedings initiated by 'Tamil Nadu Housing Board' {'TNHB'} and that the same have since been allowed.

4. Issue notice to respondent.

5. Mr.D.Veerasekharan, learned counsel, who is present in Court submits that Mr.S.Ramachandran, learned Standing Counsel for TNHB would accept notice for sole respondent.

6. Learned counsel for TNHB submits that only acquisition proceedings have come to an end vide aforementioned batch of writ petitions but that is also subject to appeal / further legal proceedings.


7. Considering the limited scope of the captioned WPs, main WPs were taken up in the Admission Board with the consent of both sides.

8. As would be evident from impugned notices, we find that there is a reference to an order dated 30.07.2024 in W.P.No.19766 of 2017 etc., batch. This order has also been described as 'Oral Order' {வாய்மொழி உத்தரவு}. We went into the High Court official website and searched if there is any order dated 30.07.2024 in W.P.No.19766 of 2017 etc., batch. We find that



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

there is an order dated 30.07.2024 in W.P.No.19766 of 2017 and a scanned reproduction of the same is as follows:





WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



W.P.No.19766 of 2017 - 1st batch

same in the additional counter affidavit. He is further directed to produce the documents to prove that Tamil Nadu Housing Board (TNHB) has taken possession of the property. The additional counter affidavit also has to state that the Survey Nos.863, 864 and 844/1K in which, the petitioners land situated along acquired by the Tamil Nadu Housing Board (TNHB) with the Documentary Proof by way of Typed Set of Papers.

5. Post this case on 14.08.2024.

30.07.2024

and

9. However, what is of greater significance is, W.P.No.19766 of 2017 etc., batch has thereafter been allowed after full contest by a detailed common order dated 23.09.2024 made by a Hon'ble single Judge and a scanned reproduction of the same is as follows:



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

2024:MHC:3432



W.P.No. 32876 of 2024, 32881 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.09.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

W.P.No.19766, 21708, 21709, 21710, 25027, 30993, 30994, 30995 and 30996 of 2017, W.P.Nos.1449, 2946, 2947, 11869, 11870, 19927 and 19928 of 2018, W.P.No.11283 of 2019 and W.P.Nos.4898, 4899 and 4900 of 2021 and W.M.P.No.11639 of 2019

W.P.No.19766 of 2017

1.T.Venkatesh & T.Chinnabhai

2.Chinnarappa

vs. Petitioners

vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu
Rep by its Secretary to Government,
Housing and Urban Development Department
Secretariat, Chennai 600 009.

2.Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Rep by its Chairman – cum Managing Director,
No.493, Anna Salai,
Chennai – 600 035.

3.The Executive Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Housing Board,
Bagalur Road,
Hasan,
Krishnagiri District.

1/18

High Court of Judicature at Madras



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



WP.No.19985 of 2013 etc., Tamil

4.The Special Talsildar,
Land Acquisition,
Housing Scheme,
Bagalur Road,
Hosur, Krishnagiri District.

Respondents-

PRAYER: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Declaration, declaring that the Land Acquisition Proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 in respect of land bearing Plot No.29 measuring an extent of 1040 Sq.ft comprised in Survey No.863 of Chennambur Village, Hosur Taluk, Krishnagiri District covered by Notification issued under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 in G.O.Ms.No.890, Housing and Urban Development Department, dated 29.05.1991 and Section 6 Declaration in G.O.Ms.No.591 Housing and Urban Development Department, dated 09.10.1992 deemed to have lapsed in view of Section 24(2) of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

For Petitioners	Mr.R.Tharath Kumar (in all WPs)
For R1 and R4	Mr.P.Kumaresan Additional Advocate General Assisted by Mr.S.R.L.Karthiga (in all WPs)
For R2 and R3	Mr.S.Ramachandran (in all WPs)

5/18

13.05.2024 10:00:00 AM



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



WP.Nos.32876 of 2024 (1st, 2nd & 3rd)

COMMON ORDER

These Writ Petitions are filed seeking a declaration that Land Acquisition Proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 in respect of the petitioners land situated in Survey Nos.863, 864 and 844 of Chenanthur Village, Hosur Taluk, Krishnagiri District, covered by Notification issued under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, in G.O.Ms.No.890, Housing and Urban Development Department, dated 29.03.1991 and Section 6 Declaration in G.O.Ms.No.691, Housing and Urban Development Department, dated 09.10.1992 deemed to have lapsed in view of Section 24(2) of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

2. It is the case of the petitioners that they purchased house sites with small extent in a layout called as 'Raguvendra Nagar' situated in Survey Nos.863, 864 and 844 situated in Chenanthur Village of Hosur Taluk, Krishnagiri District during the year 1988 and 1989 through registered Sale Deeds from previous owners. The 1st respondent issued 4(1) notification for acquisition of lands situated in Survey Nos.863, 864 and 844 for formation

1/18

11/06/2024 10:00:00 AM



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



WP.No.32876 of 2024 (C), final.

of Housing Scheme to be promoted by 2nd respondent. The 4(1) notification was issued on 29.05.1991. Subsequently, Section 5 declaration was made on 09.10.1992. The acquisition proceedings were challenged by the petitioners through an association called as 'Sri Ragavendra Nagar Residents Welfare Association' in W.P.No.17943 of 1994 and an Interim stay of dispossession was also obtained. The writ petition came to be dismissed on 20.03.2001. Sri Ragavendra Nagar Residents Welfare Association filed W.A.No.2832 of 2004 and the same was disposed on 02.08.2004 with the following observation:-

"4. Mr. Subba Reddy, learned counsel for the appellant submitted that as yet the possession has not been taken over even though twelve years have passed after the notification was issued and that he is still in possession of the property. It is for the appellant to choose to file a proper application under Section 48B of the Land Acquisition Land and if such an application is filed it is for the authority to consider it in accordance with law."

3. It is asserted by the petitioners that though 5 declaration was made as early as 09.10.1992, physical possession has not been taken over by the

4/18

It has been submitted to prove it's will.



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



WP.Nos.19716 of 2017 and 19717

respondents and petitioners continued to be in possession of their property. It is also averred in the affidavit filed in support of those writ petitions that though award was passed on 10.10.1994 vide Award No.27/1994, the compensation amount has not been paid to the petitioners. Therefore, it is the contention of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that the twin conditions laid down in the case of *Indore Development Authority vs. Manoharlal and others* reported in 2020 SCC Online SC 316 and been satisfied and as a consequence, land acquisition proceedings got lapsed under Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

4. Per contra, Mr.P.Kumaresan, learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the respondents 1 and 4 and Mr.S.Ramachandran, learned counsel appearing for the respondents 2 and 3 by taking this Court to the Possession Certificate dated 12.12.1994 and 18.03.2002, submitted that possession of the writ petitioners land in Survey No 844 was taken over on 12.12.1994 and possession of the land in Survey Nos.863 and 864 were taken over on 18.03.2002. The learned Additional Advocate General further submitted that the award was passed as early as 10.10.1994 and the award

2/18

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

WEB COPY



WP.No. 32890 of 2024, Batch

amount was deposited in treasury account as early as 16.02.1995. Therefore, it is the specific submission of the learned Additional Advocate General and the learned counsel appearing for the Housing Board that both the conditions mentioned in *Indore Development Authority* case are not satisfied in these cases. The learned Additional Advocate General further submitted that even if any one of the conditions mentioned in *Indore Development Authority* case is not satisfied, there is an lapse under Section 24(2) of New Act. However, in the case on hand, according to the learned Additional Advocate General both the conditions mentioned in the *Indore Development Authority* case are not satisfied and therefore, all the writ petitions are liable to be dismissed.

5. In *Indore Development Authority* case cited supra, the Apex Court laid down under what circumstances the acquisition proceedings initiated under Old Act will get lapsed under Section 24(2) of New Act, the relevant observation of the Apex Court reads as follows:-

16213: 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



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876 of 2024 (12-11-2024)

Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act takes place where due to inaction of authorities for five years or more prior to commencement of the said Act, the possession of land has not been taken and 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."

6. Therefore, in order to hold that land acquisition proceedings initiated under Old Act got lapsed under Section 24(2) of New Act of 2013 following conditions shall be satisfied:

(i) The award should have been passed five years prior to the commencement of the New Act and the same shall be accompanied by following two conditions:-

(a) Physical Possession of the land should not have been taken.

(b) Compensation should not have been paid to the land owners.

Therefore, in all cases where land acquisition proceedings had been initiated under the Old Act and an award had been passed five years prior to the coming into force of the New Act, the Proceedings under the Old Act will

7/13

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



WP.Nos.32876 of 2017 etc., 2018

get issued under Section 24(2) of New Act, if following two conditions are satisfied :-

- (a) physical possession has not been taken from the land owners;
- (b) compensation amount has not been paid to the land owners;

7. In the case on hand, admittedly award had been passed long back, well prior to coming into force of New Act. In the light of the law laid down by the Apex Court in *Indore Development Authority* case, we have to see whether the two conditions laid therein are satisfied in the present case. In the affidavit filed in support of these writ petitions, it was asserted by the petitioners that physical possession has not been taken over from them. However, in the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents, it has been stated that in respect of lands in Survey No.841, physical possession had been taken on 12.12.1994 and in respect of lands in Survey Nos 863 and 864, physical possession had been taken on 18.03.2002. In support of the said averment in the counter affidavit, the certificates signed by Higher Grade Revenue Inspector, Housing Project, Hosur and Chief Surveyor, Tamil Nadu Housing Board, Hosur, dated 12.12.1994 and 18.03.2002 are filed in the typed-set of papers filed by the respondents.

8718

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

8. A perusal of the certificates would suggest that the Possession Certificates were signed only by the officers of the respondents and no signature was obtained from petitioners or any respectable persons living in the locality. In *Indore Development Authority* case, while considering the question of taking possession from the land owners under Land Acquisition Proceedings, the Apex Court categorically held that preparation of Memorandum or Parchitama by the Land Acquisition Officer in the presence of witnesses would constitute a mode of taking possession of the land, the relevant observation reads as follows:-

"291. In Tamil Nadu Housing Board v. A. Vengal (supra) it was held that drawing of Parchitama in the presence of witnesses would constitute a mode of taking possession. This court observed:

"9. It is settled law by series of judgments of this Court that one of the accepted modes of taking possession of the acquired land is recording of a memorandum or Parchitama by the LAO in the presence of witnesses signed by him/them and that would constitute taking possession of the land as it would be impossible to take physical possession of the acquired land. It is common knowledge that in some cases

15/15

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876 of 2024 etc. 8/1/24

the wrong/interested person may not cooperate in taking possession of the land."

5. Ultimately, in Paragraph No.311, it was categorically held as follows:-

"311 We hold that drawing of Puccinama of taking possession is the mode of taking possession in land acquisition cases, the coupon land vests in the State and any re-entry or retaining the possession thereafter is unlawful and does not mean for conferring benefits under section 24(2) of the Act of 2013."

10. In concluding Paragraph No.402(7), it was observed as follows:-

"402(7). The mode of taking possession under the Act of 1894 and as contemplated under Section 24(2) is by drawing of inquiry 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 devesting provided under Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013, as once possession has been taken there is no lapse under Section 24(2)."

11. Therefore, it is very clear that the accepted mode of taking possession in land acquisition cases as categorically held by Constitution

(6/18)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



WP.No.12768 of 2013 (20), Bench

Bench Judgment in *Indore Development Authority* case, is drawing of Parchnama/Memorandum by the Land Acquisition Officer in the presence of witnesses. In the case on hand, the Possession Certificates relied on by the respondents are documents signed by Officers of the respondent's Department and Housing Board and the signatures of the independent witnesses do not find place. Therefore, it cannot be treated as drawing of Memorandum/Parchnama as held in *Indore Development Authority* case.

12. When the respondents are not able to produce Parchnama signed by independent witnesses to establish that the possession was indeed taken from the petitioners, I am unable to accept the contention raised on behalf of the respondents that possession was taken from the petitioners. The Possession Certificates relied on by the respondents signed by the Officers of the Housing Board and respondent's Department cannot be safely relied upon as a document evidencing taking possession, in the absence of signatures of independent witnesses as held in the *Indore Development Authority* case. Further, there is no evidence available on record to show that subject lands were developed by the Housing Board and sold to the third parties. No Sale Deeds in favour of third parties have been produced

17/18

தேசிய நீதிமன்றம், சென்னை



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



W.P.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

before this Court. Though a layout drawing prepared by Executive Engineer of Rumar Housing Unit was produced before this Court as if the lands in Survey Nos.863, 864 and 864 were also part of the layout drawings, a close scrutiny of the same would suggest that the drawing was not approved by the Competent Planning Authority. It is only a layout drawing prepared by the Officers of the Housing Board, not approved by the Planning Authority. Therefore, it is clear that respondents are not able to produce any material to show that lands in question were taken over and utilised for Housing Schemes promoted by the Housing Board. In such circumstances, I have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the respondents failed to establish the subject lands were taken over from writ petitioners.

13. Coming to the question of payment of compensation, it was asserted by the petitioners that the compensation amount was not paid to them. On the other hand, it was contended by the respondents that at the time of passing award on 10.10.1994, there was a stay of dispossession obtained by Sri Raghavendra Nagar Residents Welfare Association in W.P.No.13943 of 1994 and therefore, the amount was directed to be deposited in court. The learned Additional Advocate General also drawn the

12/18

PDF GENERATED BY



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

attention of this Court to the Challan dated 16.03.1995 to fortify his contention that compensation amount was deposited in Treasury Account.,

4. A reading of Award dated 10.10.1994 in Award No.27/94 would suggest that in view of stay by this Court, the compensation amount was directed to be deposited before the Court. However, the respondents have not deposited the amount before the Court but deposited it in Treasury Account as seen from the copy of Challan included in the respondents typed-set of papers. As rightly pointed out by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that in the backside of the Challan while mentioning the award number, it was originally written as 25/94 and thereafter, it was rounded and corrected as 27/94. Further, the date of award was mentioned as 12.10.1994 as against actual date of 10.10.1994. Therefore, it is not clear whether the Challan dated 16.03.1995 produced in the typed-set of papers filed by the respondents is relating to the Award No.27/94 or 25/94. Further, in *Indore Development Authority* case, while considering the question of payment of compensation amount to the land owners, the Apex Court held as follows:-

13/18

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



WP.Nos.32876 of 2024 and 32881

"402(3) 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 show that acquisition has lapsed under Section 24(2) due to non-payment or non-deposit of compensation amount. 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 1912."

13. Therefore, it is clear that there must be some evidence on the part of respondents to show that compensation amount was actually tendered to the land owners and they refused to receive the same and as a consequence, the amount was either deposited in the court deposit or in the treasury deposit. In the case on hand, absolutely there is no evidence available on record to show that the amount was tendered to the land owners and refused by them. In the award, it was stated that in view of pendency of writ petition and interim stay of dispossession, the amount was directed to be deposited in the court. However, the respondents have not deposited the amount before the Court but deposited it in treasury account.

14/8

14/8/2024



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876 to 32890 of 2024

16. As per the law laid down in *Indore Development Authority* case, even if amount is deposited in the interest bearing treasury account that is sufficient provided prior to the deposit, amount was tendered to the land owners and refused by them. The writ petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed as early as 20.07.2011 and writ appeal filed by the petitioner was also disposed of as early as 02.08.2014. The respondents could have at least tendered the amount to the land owners after disposal of the writ appeal. Now, 20 years have gone from the date of disposal of writ appeal, still the amount appeared to be in treasury deposit. Absolutely, there is no evidence available on record to show why there was no attempt made by the respondents to tender the amount to the land owners atleast after disposal of the writ appeal in the year 2004.

17. It is also brought to the notice of this Court that similar writ petitions filed by the other land owners covered by the same Land Acquisition Notification in W.P.No.37524 of 2015 and W.P.Nos.5753 to 5755 of 2015 and the same were allowed by this Court by order dated 04.04.2016 declaring lapse of land acquisition notification issued under Old Act.

13/18

FILED IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

18. In such circumstances, I have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the respondents failed to show that the compensation amount was tendered to the land owners and refused by them. The respondents have not produced any document to show that the amount was tendered to the petitioners or the previous land owners in whose favour the revenue records stood at the time of acquisition. Mere deposit of the compensation amount in the treasury account would not amount to tendering of the compensation amount to the land owners. Therefore, I hold, the respondents failed to establish that compensation amount was actually tendered to the land owners and refused by them.

19. In view of the discussion made earlier, the twin conditions mentioned in *Indore Development Authority* case namely failure to take possession from the land owners and failure to tender the compensation amount to the land owners are satisfied in the present case. Therefore, the Land Acquisition Proceedings initiated under the Old Act got lapsed under Section 24(2) of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

15/18

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



WEB COPY



WP.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024



W/No.1166 of 2024, Krb.

22. Accordingly, all the Writ Petitions are Allowed. No costs.
Consequently, the connected writ on sec.lance as petition is closed.

23.09.2024

Index : Yes
Speaking order: Yes
Neutral Citation: Yes
dm

To

1.The Secretary to Government,
State of Tamil Nadu
Housing and Urban Development Department
Secretariat, Chennai- 600 009.

2.The Chairman - cum - Managing Director,
Tamil Nadu Housing Board
No.493, Anna Sala,
Chennai - 600 035.

3.The Executive Engineer,
Tamil Nadu Housing Board,
Bagalur Road,
Hosur, Krishnagiri District.

4.The Special Tahsildar,
Land Acquisition, Housing Scheme,
Bagalur Road, Hosur, Krishnagiri District.

17/58

Digitized by eGangotri



W.P.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

10. To be noted, aforementioned common order dated 23.09.2024 made by a Hon'ble single Judge has been reported in Neutral Citation portal of this Court and the Neutral Citation is **2024:MHC:3432**.

11. A careful perusal of the aforementioned 23.09.2024 common order makes it clear that land acquisition proceedings have been quashed. This means that an order issued based on 30.07.2024 order (order prior to the final order) will not have any legs to stand. On this short point, impugned notices are set aside but it is made clear that all rights and contentions of writ petitioners as well as TNHB are preserved for further proceedings {including appeals against quashing of land acquisition proceedings (if any)}. If TNHB is to initiate further / fresh proceedings post quashing of impugned notices, all rights and contentions of TNHB as well as possible noticees including writ petitioners are also preserved for that purpose also.

12. We make it clear that we have not expressed any view or opinion on the merits of the matter and we have interfered only on the short point that a notice cannot be issued on the basis of an interim order describing the same as வாய்மொழி உத்தரவு after main matters itself have been allowed by a Hon'ble single Judge vide a common final order.



W.P.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

WEB COPY Captioned five WPs are disposed of in the aforesaid manner.

Consequently, captioned five Writ Miscellaneous Petitions are disposed of as closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M.S.,J.)

(K.R.S.,J.)

12.11.2024

(1/2)

Index : Yes / No

Neutral Citation : Yes / No

Speaking order / Non-speaking order

mk

To

The Executive Engineer and
Administrative Officer
Tamil Nadu Housing Board
Bhagalur Road,
Hosur - 635 109.

Page Nos.25/26



WEB COPY



W.P.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

M.SUNDAR, J.,
and

K.RAJASEKAR, J.,

mk

W.P.Nos.32876, 32881, 32885, 32888 and 32890 of 2024

12.11.2024
(1/2)

Page Nos.26/26